THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

WITH
Translation and Explanatory Notes

BY
S.D. JOSHI
AND
J. A. F. ROODBERGEN

VOLUME X
(7.1.1 – 7.1.103)

SAHITYA AKADEMI

THE
AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ
OF
PĀṆINI

THE
AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ
OF
PĀṆINI

WITH
Translation and Explanatory Notes

BY

S. D. JOSHI
AND
J. A. F. ROODBERGEN

VOLUME X
(7.1.1 - 7.1.103)

SAHITYA AKADEMI

The AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ of PĀṆINI Vol. X

First Published 2003

Sahitya Akademi

Head Office :
Rabindra Bhavan, 35 Ferozeshah Road, New Delhi 110001

Sales Section :
'Swati', Mandir Marg, New Delhi 110001

Regional Offices :
Jeewan Tara Building, 4th Floor, 23A/44X, Diamond Harbour Road, Kolkata 700053
172 Mumbai Marathi Grantha Sangrahalaya Marg, Dadar, Mumbai 400014
Central College Campus, Dr. Ambedkar Veedhi, Bangalore 560001
CIT Campus, TTTI, Post, Taramani, Chennai 600113

Price : Rs. 250/-

ISBN 81-260-1705-8

Laser Typeset by :
Aksharchhaya, 2035 Sadashiv Peth, Tilak Road, Pune 411030

Printed at :
Nagri Printers, Delhi 110032

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to the authorities of the Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, for accepting our work on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as a publication of the Akademi.

We also thank Mr. Ninad Mate and Miss Rājashree Sādhu (M.A., LL.B.) of Aksharchhaya, Pune, for the interest shown and for the careful work done in preparing the press copy of the present volume.

Pune
November 2002

S. D. Joshi
J. A. F. Roodbergen

My sincere thanks are due to the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO) for the travel grant awarded in 2002.

J. A. F. Roodbergen

Bibliography

Works quoted by abbreviation or title

A. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (quoted after *Pāṇini's Grammatik.* Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von Otto Böhtlingk. Leipzig 1887. Nachdruck Hildesheim 1964.)

ANA *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Anabhihitāhnika* (P. 2.3.1-2.3.17). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit.* Class C, No. 11. University of Poona. Poona 1976.

AP I *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume I (1.1.1-1.1.75). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1991.

AP II *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume II (1.2.1-1.2.73). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1993.

AP III *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume III (1.3.1-1.3.93). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1994.

AP IV *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume IV (1.4.1-1.4.110). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1995.

AP V *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume V (2.1.1-2.1.72). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1996.

AP VI *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume VI (2.2.1-2.2.38). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1997.

AP VII *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume VII (2.3.1-2.3.73). Sahitya

Akademi. New Delhi 1998.

AP VIII — *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume VIII (2.4.1-2.4.85). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 1999.

AP IX — *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. With Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Volume IX (6.4.1-6.4.175). Sahitya Akademi. New Delhi 2002.

BDA — *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Bahuvrīhidvandāhnika* (P. 2.2.23-2.2.38). Text, Translation and Notes by J.A.F. Roodbergen. Edited by S. D. Joshi. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 9. University of Poona. Poona 1974.

DSG — *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. By . . . K.V. Abhyankar and J. M. Shukla . . . Oriental Institute. Baroda ²1977.

FANU — *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*. By S. D. Joshi and S. Bhate. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class B, No. 9. University of Poona. Pune 1984.

KA — *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Karmadhārayāhnika* (P. 2.1.5-2.1.72). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 6. University of Poona. Poona 1971.

KĀRA — *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Kārakāhnika* (P. 1.4.23-1.4.55). Introduction, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 10. University of Poona. Poona 1975.

KV — *The Kāśikāvṛtti with the Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary and Padamañjarī*. Critically edited by Swami Dwarikadas Shastri and Pt. Kalikaprasad Shukla. Vols I-VI. Varanasi 1965-1967.

(Hyderabad edition) *Kāśikā. A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar*. By Vāmana and Jayāditya. Editors Dr. A Sharma (and) Shri K.

	Deshpande. Sanskrit Academy. Osmania University. Part I. Hyderabad 1969. Part II, Hyderabad 1970.
Mbh.	*The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Volume I. First Edition 1880. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona 1962. Volume II. First Edition 1883. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona 1965. Volume III. First Edition 1885. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona 1972.
Paribhāṣā-saṃgraha	(a collection of original works on *Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās*) Edited criti cally . . . By K. V. Abhyankar. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1967.
PASPA	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Paspaśāhnika*. Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 15. University of Poona. Pune 1986.
PN	*The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojibhaṭṭa*. Edited and Explained by F. Kielhorn. Part II. Translation and Notes. Second Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1960. Part I. Edited Critically by MM. K. V. Abhyankar. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1962.
PRĀTI	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Prātipadikārthaśeṣāhnika* (P. 2.3.46-2.3.71). Introduction, Text. Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 14. University of Poona. Pune 1981.
SA	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Samarthāhnika* (P. 2.1.1). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 5. University of Poona. Poona 1968.
SK	*The Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita* with the *Tattvabodhinī* commentary of Jñānendra Sarasvatī and the *Subodhinī* commentry of Jayakṛṣṇa. Edited by Vasudev Lakshman Shastri Panashikar. *Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan*. Delhi 1994.

STHĀNI Pt.I	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Sthānivadbhāvāhnika*. Part I (P. 1.1.56-1.1.57). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Research Unit Publications No. 11. Pune 1990.
STHĀNI Pt.II	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Sthānivadbhāvāhnika* Part II (P. 1.1.58-1.1.59). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Research Unit Publications No. 12. Pune 1996.
TA	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Tatpuruṣāhnika* (P. 2.2.2-2.2.23). Edited with Translation and Explanatory Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 7. University of Poona. Poona 1973.
VIBHA	*Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Vibhaktyāhnika* (P. 2.3.16-2.3.45). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes by S. D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*. Class C, No. 13. University of Poona. Pune 1980.

⊛ ⊛ ⊛

Works quoted by the name of the author

Agrawala, V. S.	*India as known to Pāṇini*. Second edition. Prithvi Prakashan : Varanasi 1963.
Candragomin	*Cāndravyākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Part I. Edited by K. Ch. Chatterji. Deccan College : Poona 1953. Part II. Deccan College : Poona 1961.
Chandra Vasu	*The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Edited and Translated into English by Late Śrīśa Chandra Vasu. 1891. Reprint Motilal Banarsidass : Delhi 1962.
Geldner, K. F.	*Der Rig-Veda*. Erster Teil. Harvard Oriental Series. Volume 34. Harvard University Press : Cambridge, Massachusetts 1951; Zweiter Teil, *H.O.S.* Volume 34. 1951; Dritter Teil, *H.O.S.* Volume 35. 1951.

Joshi, S. D. — "Syntactic and Semantic Devices in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini" in : *Journal of Indian Philosophy*. Volume 29. Dordrecht-Boston-London 2001, p. 155-167.

Joshi, S. D. and Roodbergen, J.A.F. — "On *kāraka, vibhakti* and *samāsa*" in : *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. LXXX, p. 95-112. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute : Pune 2000.

Kiparsky, P. — *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Edited by S. D. Joshi. The MIT Press. Cambridge and London. Co-published by the Poona University Press. Pune 1979.

id. — *Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini's Grammar*. Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 16. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Poona 1982.

Whitney, W. D. — *Sanskrit Grammar*. Second Edition. Harvard University Press : Cambridge, Massachusetts 1889. Reprint 1955.

Abbreviations of Terms

abl.	ablative
acc.	accusative
act.	active
aor.	aorist
ātm.	*ātmanepada*
Bh.	(Patañjali-)*Bhāṣya*
bv(s)	*bahuvrīhi(s)*
cp(s)	compound(s)
dat.	dative
Dhp.	*Dhātupāṭha*
du.	dual
gen.	genitive
imp.	imperative
impf.	imperfect
instr.	instrumental
kdh(s)	*karmadhāraya(s)*

loc.	locative
nom.	nominative
ntr.	neuter
P.	*Pāṇinisūtra*
par.	*parasmaipada*
pass.	passive
pbh(s)	*paribhāṣā(s)*
pf.	perfect
pl.	plural
sg.	singular
tp(s)	*tatpuruṣa(s)*
voc.	vocative
Vt(s)	*Vārttika(s)*

Introduction

P. 7.1 : Survey of the *pāda*

A. The main topic

The main topic of the *pāda* is *aṅga*, continued from P. 6.4. For details see *AP* IX, Introduction, p. ix.

B. The organization of P. 7.1

Rules have been grouped together in sections dealing with types of grammatical operations. The two main types of operations are substitution and augmentation. They are unequally divided among sections. Associative digressions may be introduced which fall outside the topic of the section. An example is P. 7.1.53, which is a substitution rule in a section dealing with augment rules. Also, overlapping the division according to types of operations, groupings of rules are made due to the conditions, like *ataḥ* (P. 7.1.9), *chandasi* and *sarvanāmasthāne*. Obviously, in the organization of the rules *anuvṛtti* plays a big role.

We mention the following sections:

(1) P. 7.1.1-37, substitution rules, and incidentally augment rules.

(2) P. 7.1.38-50, *chandas* rules, including three *nipātana* rules, P. 7.1.43, 48 and 49. In the *chandas* rules features of the Vedic language are treated as substitutions or augments in relation to features established for the *bhāṣā*. Compare Kiparsky 1979, p. 56.

(3) P. 7.1.51-83, augment rules. The augments are *asUK* (P. 7.1.50-51), *sUṬ* (P. 7.1.52), *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.54-57), *nUM* (P. 7.1.58-83).

Within section (3) P. 7.1.70-79 are conditioned by *sarvanāmasthāne*.

(4) P. 7.1:84-89, substitution rules.

(5) P. 7.1.90-93, *ṇittva*.

(6) P. 7.1.93-94, substitution rules.

Within the sections (4)-(6) P. 7.1.86-99 are generally conditioned by *sarvanāmasthāne*.

(7) P. 7.1.95-97, *tṛjvadbhāva* of *kroṣṭu*.

(8) P. 7.1.98-99, augment rules.

(9) P. 7.1.100-103, substitution rules

Among the rules collected in P. 7.1 there are 21 rules dealing with the Vedic language, a fairly high percentage. Here the big grouping is section (2). Incidental *chandas* rules are P. 7.1.8; 10, 26, 56, 57, 76, 77, 83, and 103.

The organization of the *pāda* as a whole has been carefully planned.

C. Synopsis of rules

P. 7.1.1 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the artificial (non-linguistic) elements *yu* and *vu* forming part of a suffix, like *LyuṬ* and *ṆvuL*, coming after a verbal base *aṅga*. The substitutes are *ana* and *aka* respectively. Examples are *nandanaḥ* 'one who gladdens' and *kārakaḥ* 'one who acts.' According to tradition, the semivowels in *yu* and *vu* are nasalized, but in the A. no mention is made of a nasalized *y* or *v*.

There are 22 *Vts* on the rule. *Vts* IV-IX deal with *ugittva* 'being marked with (the *anubandha*) *U*' attributed to *yu* and *vu*. This creates a number of problems to solve which the *Vts* are phrased. Eventually, *Vt*. XXII rejects all previous *Vts*.

P. 7.1.2 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the artificial (*upadeśa*) elements *ph*, *dh*, *kh*, *ch* and *gh* in initial position of a suffix, like *phaK*, *ḍhaK*, *kha*, *cha* and *gha*, coming after a nominal base *aṅga*. The substitutes are *āyan*, *ey*, *īn*, *īy* and *iy* respectively. Examples are *nāḍāyanaḥ* 'a *gotra* descendant of Naḍa,' *sauparṇeyaḥ* 'a descendant of Suparṇā,' *gārgīyaḥ* 'a descendant of Gārgya' and *kṣattriyah* 'a descendant of Kṣatra.' According to the *KV*, the substitutions takes place already in the *upadeśa*. Thus *phaK*, etc., are not introduced in the *prakriyā* without being replaced. Once the substitutions have taken place, the suffixes become *ādyudātta*. That is demonstrated with the help of the suffix *ghaC* (P. 4.4.117).

We have five *Vts* on the rule. *Vts* I and II deal with *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like an *upadeśa* element.' *Vts* III-IV deal with *uṇādi* suffixes. In his *bhāṣya*

on *Vt*. V Patañjali declares that in Pāṇini's system nominal stems derived with *uṇādi* suffixes are regarded as underivable stems.

P. 7.1.3 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the artificial (*upadeśa*) element *jh* in initial position of the suffixes *jhi* and *jha* (P. 3.4.78) coming after a verbal base *aṅga*.The substitute is *ant*. The *KV*, following Patañjali, notes that in the present rule the word *ādi* form P. 7.1.2 is not continued. The reason for that is found in the Vedic form *śayāntai*. The *prakriyā* of this form is provided. It is pointed out that Patañjali, and, therefore, the *KV* also, is wrong. Examples for the rule are *kurvanti* 'they do' and *sunvanti* 'they press (Soma).'

We have six *Vts* on the rule. The discussion, which is rather technical, centres on the question whether a prohibition should be stated regarding the substitution of *jh* by *ant* which is not in initial position of a suffix. *Vts* II and III say, albeit in different ways, that we can manage without a prohibition. *Vt*. IV points out a difficulty in connection with the form *śāyāntai*. *Vt* V proposes a way out. *Vt*. VI invokes P. 7.1.6, where the word *ca* is to be added, so that we obtain a statement of *saṃniyoga*, that is, *samāveśa* 'joint application/comjunctive application,' namely of the augment *rUT* and the substitution of *at* for *jha*. The point involved is explained with the help of the *prakriyā* of *śerate* 'they lie down.' Patañjali objects. He thinks that, instead of joint application, the result of adding *ca* in P. 7.1.6 would be *paryāya* 'application in turn.' Therefore Patañjali proposes a different solution, which renders the addition of *ca* in P. 7.1.6 unnecessary.

It is pointed out that in the derivation of *śerate*, in the stage *śī* + ° + *jha* where *ŚaP* is *luk*-deleted, we have to apply P. 7.1.5. Once that rule is applied by taking into account the *siddha*-principle, P. 7.1.6 becomes applicable for the addition of the augment *rUṬ*, and no difficulty ensues.

P. 7.1.4 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the artificial (*upadeśa*) element *jh* in initial position of a suffix coming after a reduplicated verbal base *aṅga*. The substitute is *at*. Examples are *dadati* 'they give,' *jakṣati* 'they eat' and *jāgrati* 'they are awake.' The *prakriyā* of *dadati* is provided.

As noted by the *KV*, P. 7.1.4 is an *apavāda* in relation to P. 7.1.3. But it is itself set aside by P. 3.4.109, which prescribes the finite verb ending *Jus* in place of *jhi* for the 3rd pl. impf. ending.

P. 7.1.5 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the artificial (*upadeśa*) element *jh* in initial position of a suffix coming after a verbal base *aṅga*

which does not end in short *a*. The substitute is *at*. Examples are *punate* 'they clean' and *acinvata* 'they piled up.' The *prakriyā* of *punate* is provided.

In connection with the counterexamples quoted by the *KV* there is a discussion regarding conflict procedure. In traditional terms the conflict involves a *nitya* 'invariably applicable' rule and an *anitya* rule. Here the *nitya* rule prevails. In terms of the *siddha*-principle, the conflict happens to be a one-way conflict. Here the environment changing rule prevails. The result is the same.

P. 7.1.6 is an augment rule. The augment is *rUṬ* and it is added to the substitute *at* which comes in place of *jh* at the beginning of a finite verb ending coming after the verbal base *śī-* 'to lie down.' Examples are *śerate* 'they lie down' and *aśerata* 'they lied down.'

The *KV* notes that the rule does not apply to *yaṅluk* formations. An example is *vyatiśeśyate* 'they surpass each other again and again.' The *prakriyā* is provided.

There are five *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that a prohibition should be phrased for *guṇa* in the case of *dṛś-* 'to see,' when followed immediately by the augment *rUK*. The forms in question are *adṛśran* and *adṛśram*, both attested in the ṚgV. Traditionally they are assumed to be an aor. 3rd pl. and 1st sg. The *prakriyā* of *adṛśran* as an aor. form is provided. Patañjali correctly argues that the *Vt*. is required for *adṛśram*, but not for *adṛśran*. It is, however, possible to justify the *Vt*. by interpreting both forms as Vedic impf. forms. To show that, the *prakriyā* of *adṛśram* as an impf. form is provided.

Vt. II says that a prescription for *guṇa* (of the verbal base vowel in *śī-*) is to be phrased if the augment *rUṬ* is viewed as the final element of the preceding linguitsic unit. The example is *śerate* 'they lie down,' analysed as *śī* + *r* + *ate*. This analysis cannot be justified by assuming that the augment is not *rUṬ*, but *rUK*. The latter form of the augment will do nicely in the case of *adṛśran*, because it absolves us from phrasing a prohibition of *guṇa* here, but it fails in the case of *śerate*. In his discussion Patañjali then refers to *Vt*. II on P. 3.1.86, which prescribes the suffix *aK* for Vedic *āśīrliṅ* forms of *dṛś-*. He finally comes to the conclusion that a separate statement, phrased as *dṛśer ak* 'after *dṛś-* *aK* (is to be added),' is required to debar *guṇa* for *dṛś* in *adṛśran* and *adṛśram*. In this connection the *prakriyā* of the Vedic *āśīrliṅ* form *dṛśeyam* 'may I see' is provided. But, as long as *adṛśran* and *adṛśram* are viewed as aor. forms, it makes no difference whether *aK* is applied, or the suffix *aṄ*, prescribed for Vedic *āśīrliṅ* forms by P. 3.1.86 itself.

Vt. III-V deal with the addition of the augment *āṬ* in the Vedic subjunctive of *śī*-. The corresponding *prakriyā* is provided. Patañjali explains that here, on account of *pūrvavipratiṣedha*, the augment rule (P. 3.4.94) prevails over the substitution of *jh* by *ant* by P. 7.1.3. *Vt*. IV rejects the idea of *pūrvavipratiṣedha*, because the augment *āṬ* is *nitya* 'invariably applicable.' Being *nitya*, it prevails. In fact, however, the augment rule prevails because it is a word-building rule. *Vt*. V adds another reason for rejecting *pūrvavipratiṣedha*, by invoking *antaraṅgatva* in the sense that the addition of the augment *āṬ* requires less conditions than the *aṬ*-substitution by P. 7.1.5. Patañjali thinks that the *antaraṅgatva* argument holds good conditionally only. His own solution is to invoke P. 2.4.73, which says that in *chandas* the *luk*-deletion of *ŚaP* is variously applied. An explanation of what Patañjali means is presented.

P. 7.1.7 is an augment rule. The augment is *rUṬ* again. It is preferably not adddd to the substitute *at* which comes in place of *jh* at the beginning of a finite verb ending after the verbal base *aṅga vid* 'to know.' An examples is *saṃvidate/saṃvidrate* 'they know thoroughly.' The preferred form is *saṃvidate.*

P. 7.1.8 is a *chandas* rule dealing with the augment *rUṬ*. It says that in the Vedic language this augment variously added under the same conditions as stated in the previous rules. The example is *devā aduhra / gandharvā apsaraso aduhra* 'the gods milked, the Gandharvas and the apsararas milked.'

P. 7.1.9 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the case ending *bhis* coming after a stem ending in short *a*. The substitute is *ais*. Examples are *vṛkṣaiḥ* 'by means of trees' and *atijarasaiḥ* 'by extremely old ones.' The *KV* explains the cp.-formation of the latter example.

A *kārikā* is quoted by the *KV* from the *bhāṣya* on this rule. It deals with a two-way conflict, namely, between P. 7.1.9 and P. 7.3.103. The *kārika* proposes two ways for solving the conflict. The first way is by having recourse to the *para*-principle (P. 1.4.2). The second way is by having recourse to *bhūtapūrvagati* 'the understanding that something was there in an earlier stage.' Reference is to the stem final vowel *a*, like in the stage *vṛkṣa* + *bhis*. Then the *kārikā* assumes that P. 7.1.9 prevails over P. 7.3.102 by the *nitya*-principle. The correct solution, not provided by tradition, is to apply the *utsarga-apavāda* principle.

P. 7.1.10 is a *chandas* rule. It notes that in the Vedic language *ais* is variously substituted for *bhis*. The examples are *nadyaiḥ* 'by means of rivers' and *devebhiḥ sarvebhiḥ proktam* 'promulgated by all gods.'

P. 7.1.11 prohibits the *ais*-substitution for *bhis* in the case of the pronominal stems *idam* 'this' and *adas* 'that.' An exception is made for these stems when the *taddhita* suffix *akaC* is added. The examples are *ebhiḥ* 'by these' and *amībhiḥ* 'by those.' The countexamples are *imakaiḥ* 'by these' and *amukaiḥ* 'by those.' From the negative condition *akoḥ* in the rule a clue is derived which later on became *PN*, *pbh.* 89.

It is pointed out that in the derivation of *imakaiḥ* P. 7.2.113 is not applied. The reason is that P. 7.1.11 changes the environment is which P. 7.2.113 is to be applied. Therefore, by the *siddha*-principle P. 7.1.11 prevails.

The *KV* enters into a discussion with Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the rule, and points out the flaw in his proposal to rephrase the rule.

P. 7.1.12 is a substiution rule. The items to be replaced are the case endings *Ṭā*, *ṄasI* and *Ṅas* coming after a stem ending in short *a*. The substitutes are *ina*, *āt* and *sya* respectively. Examples are *vṛkṣeṇa* 'by means of a tree,' *vṛkṣāt* 'from a tree' and *vṛkṣasya* 'of a tree.' As further examples provided by other grammarians the *KV* quotes the forms *atijarasina* 'by an extremely old one' and *atijarasāt* 'from an extremely old one.' The *prakriyā* of *atijarasina* is provided. For the derivation tradition appeals to *pūrvavipratiṣedha*. The two conflicting rules concerned are P. 7.1.12 and P. 7.2.101. Here it is assumed that P. 7.1.12 prevails. It is shown that the application of the *siddha*-principle works well. It also does away with the misconception of *pūrvavipratiṣedha*.

P. 7.1.13 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the sg. dat. case ending *Ṅe* coming after a stem ending in short *a*. The substitute is *ya*. An example is *vṛkṣāya* 'to a tree.' Vowel lengthening is by P. 7.3.102.

P. 7.1.14 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the sg. dat. case ending *Ṅe* coming after a pronominal stem ending in short *a*. The substitute is *smai*. Examples are *sarvasmai* 'to all' and *kasmai* 'to whom?'

We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that in P. 2.4.32 inclusion is to be made of *smai*, etc., so that we can justify usages like *atrāsmai* 'here to this.' Here the difficulty lies in the application of P. 6.1.101 which prescribes single substitution. *Vt.* II rejects *Vt.* I by saying *na vā bahiraṅgalakṣaṇatvāt* 'or rather not, because (the single substitution) is dependent on an outside cause.' Reference is to what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 50. It is pointed out that *na vā bahiraṅgalakṣaṇatvāt* is one of Kātyāyana's standard expressions.

P. 7.1.15 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the sg. abl. and loc. case endings coming after a pronominal stem ending in short *a*. The substitutes are *smāt* and *smin* respectively. Examples are *sarvasmāt* 'from all,' *yasmāt* 'from him who,' *sarvasmin* 'in all' and *yasmin* 'in him who.'

P. 7.1.16 is a substitution rule containing *vā*. The items to be preferably replaced are the sg. abl. and loc. case endings coming after the nine pronominal stems beginning with *pūrva* 'earlier' and ending in short *a*. The substitutes are *smai* and *smin* respectively. The non-preferred forms follow the nominal declension. Examples are *pūrvasmāt / pūrvāt* and *pūrvasmin / pūrve*.

P. 7.1.17 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the pl. nom. case ending *Jas* coming after a pronominal stem ending in short *a*. The substitute is *ŚI*. Examples are *sarve* 'all' (pl. nom. masc.) and *ye* 'those who' (pl. nom. masc.).

An Excursus on Pāṇini's treatment of inflectional and non-inflectional morphology has been added to the rule.

P. 7.1.18 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the du. nom./ acc. case suffix *auṄ* coming after a nominal stem ending in a fem. suffix. The substitute is *ŚI*. Examples are *khaṭve tiṣṭhataḥ* 'the two cots are there,' *bahurāje* 'two fem. items having many kings' and *kārīṣagandhye* 'two female descendants of Karīṣagandhi.' The *prakriyās* of *bahurāje* and *kārīṣagandhye* are provided.

The *KV* quotes two *kārikās* from the *Mbh.* on P. 7.1.18. They consist of objections and four short answers.

P. 7.1.19 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is *auṄ* again coming after a neuter stem. The substitute is *ŚI*. Examples are *kuṇḍe tiṣṭhataḥ* 'the two pitchers are there,' *kuṇḍe paśya* 'look at the two pitchers,' *dadhinī* 'the two items of sour milk' and *trapuṇī* 'the two items of tin.' In the last two examples the augment *nUM* is inserted by P. 7.1.73.

P. 7.1.20 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the pl. nom./ acc. case endings *Jas* and *Śas* coming after a neuter stem. The substitute is *Śi*. Examples are *kuṇḍāni tiṣṭhanti* 'the pitchers are there,' *kuṇḍāni paśya* 'look at the pitchers,' *dadhīni* 'items of sour milk' and *trapūṇi* 'items of tin.' Here the augment *nUM* is inserted by P 7.1.73, and vowel lengthening is by P. 6.4.8.

P. 7.1.21 is a substitution rule. The items to be substituted are the pl. nom./acc. case endings *Jas* and *Śas* coming after the numeral stem *aṣṭā* 'eight.' The substitute is *auŚ*. It is noted that there are two stem forms, *aṣṭā* and *aṣṭa*. The examples are *aṣṭau tiṣṭhanti* 'there are eight' and *aṣṭau paśya* 'look at the eight.'

According to the *KV*, the mention of the stem form *aṣṭā* provides a clue, namely, that P. 7.2.84 is optional. It is explained how the clue is arrived at. The *KV* also points out that P. 7.1.21 is an *apavāda* 'exception' to P. 7.1.22. But the application of P. 7.1.21 is also desired when *aṣṭan* (a *ṣaṣ* numeral by P. 1.1.24) occurs as the final member of a cp. An example is *uttamāṣṭau* 'the best eight.' In the *bv.* cp. *priyāṣṭānaḥ* 'to whom (pl.) eight are dear' the *auŚ*-substitution is not applied, because in this case the numeral stem does not end in long *ā*.

We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* containing two *Śloka-vārttikas*.

P. 7.1.22 is a *luk*-deletion rule. The items to be deleted are the case endings *Jas* and *Śas* coming after the six numeral stems called *ṣaṣ*. Examples are *ṣaṭ tiṣṭhanti* 'there are six,' *ṣaṭ paśya* 'look at the six,' *pañca* 'five,' and *daśa* 'ten.' According to the *KV*, the rule also applies to what ends in *ṣaṣ*. An example is *uttamaṣaṭ* 'the best six.' But *luk*-deletion does not take place when the *sas*-numeral is the final member of a *bv.* cp. Examples are *priyaṣaṣaḥ* 'those to whom six are dear' and *priyapañcānaḥ* 'those to whom five are dear.'

P. 7.1.23 is a *luk*-deletion rule. The items to be deleted are the sg. nom. and acc. case endings *sU* and *am* coming after a neuter stem. Examples are *dadhi tiṣṭhati* 'there is sour milk,' *dadhi paśya* 'look at the sour milk,' and *trapu* 'tin' (sg. nom./acc.).

The example *tad brāhmaṇakulam* 'this is a brahmin family,' borrowed from Patañjali, occasions a grammatical discussion on the derivation of the form *tad*. In the derivation three rules are involved, P. 7.1.23, P. 7.2.102 and P. 7.1.24. To determine their order of application - which rule to apply first? -, the *KV* invokes two traditional conflict-solving principles, namely, *pūrvavipratiṣedha* and *nityatva*, but concentrates on *nityatva*. The difficulty in the derivation of *tad* arises, because after the application of the conditioning rule P. 7.2.102 we have to apply P. 7.1.24. But the application of P. 7.1.24 destroys the *nimitta* of P. 7.1.23. To solve this difficulty, the *KV* invokes what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 47. This *pbh*. says that a rule (A) whose *nimitta* is destroyed by a third rule (C), after the application of a second rule (B), is not *anitya*. Being *nitya*, it prevails over the two other rules. Accordingly,

P. 7.1.23 is applied first. Since it is a *luk*-deletion rule, there is no chance any more of applying P. 7.2.102 and 7.1.24. *Tad* is regularly derived.

A comparison is made between *nityatva* and the *siddha*-principle. When two rules are involved, they usually work equally well. The examples are *asau* 'that one (over there)' and *aijyata* 'it was sacrificed.' Then the question is raised whether they also work equally well when three rules (A), (B) and (C), are involved, of which (B) conditions (C), and of which (C) destroys the *nimitta* of (A). In such a case, to determine the order of rule application, we will have recourse to what is called the extended version of the *siddha*-principle. An example is found in *dudyūṣati* 'he wishes to play dice.' For conflicts involving three rules tradition has phrased two *pbhs*, namely, *PN*, *pbhs* 47 and 48. As an example for *pbh*. 48 the same form *dudyūṣati* is quoted and explained. The conclusion is that the difference between *nityatva* and the *siddha*-principle lies mainly in the economy of statement. *Nityatva* requires seven *pbhs*, of which *pbh*. 48 does not offer a grammatical guide-line, but refers to usage, whereas the *siddha*-principle, including its extended version, offers a uniform grammatical principle applicable in all cases.

We have four *Vts* on the rule. According to *Vt* I, the *luk*-deletion prescribed by P. 7.1.23 also applies after·after *tyad-ādi* words. *Vts* II-IV deal with three other rules dealing with neuter stems, namely, P. 7.1.19, 20 and 72. The underlying question is, how to construe the word *napuṃsakāt* in P. 7.1.23. Two alternatives are offered, known as *arthagrahaṇa* 'reference to a gender meaning (of a cp. as a whole)' and *śabdagrahaṇa* 'reference to (the gender of) a specific word, (namely, a neuter cp. constituent).'

P. 7.1.24 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the sg. nom. and acc. case endings *sU* and *am* coming after a neuter stem ending in short *a*. The substitute is *am*. Examples are *kuṇḍaṃ tiṣṭhati* 'there is a pitcher,' *kuṇḍaṃ paśya* 'look at the pitcher,' and *pīṭham* 'a seat.'

P. 7.1.25 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the sg. nom. and acc. endings *sU* and *am* coming after the neuter stems mentioned as *Ḍatarādi*, ending in short *a*. The substitute is stated as *adḌ*. The actual substitute is *at*. Examples are *katarat tiṣṭhati* 'who out of two is there?,' *katarat paśya* 'look at whom out of two,' *katamat tiṣṭhati* 'who out of many is there?,' and the sg. nom./acc. forms *itarat, anyatarat, anyat,* all three meaning 'something else.'

After a discussion on the function of the *anubandha Ḍ* in *adḌ*, the *KV* raises the question, why the substitute has not simply been stated as *t*. It is pointed out

that in this case we cannot correctly derive the sg. voc. of the forms mentioned.

We have four *Vts* on the rule which are deemed of no use.

P. 7.1.26 is a *sūtra* prohibiting the substitution of *adḌ* for *su* and *am* after the neuter stem *itara* in the Vedic language. The *KV* provides two Vedic examples. Then a question is raised. Suppose *na* is dropped from the rule and the remainder *itarāc chandasi*, is put immediately after P. 7.1.24. But then, what could be the purpose of *na* in P. 7.1.26? The answer is stated by *Vt*. I on the rule.

We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. II deals with the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, and thus leads over to P. 7.1.27. The *Vt*. says that in the case of the two stems mentioned the substitution of the case ending *am* prevails over the neuter substitutions (*śĪ* and *śi* prescribed by P. 7.1.19 and 20), according to conflict procedure. For *yuṣmad*-derivations used in the neuter Patañjali quotes two examples. The corresponding *prakriyās* are provided. It is noted that in the derivation of *tvam* (as a neuter form) the application of P. 7.2.90, which is a *lopa*-rule, poses a difficulty, because this rule is interpreted in two ways. According to one of the interpretations, P. 7.2.90 prescribes *ṭilopa*, that is, *lopa* of the sequence *a* + *d* of the stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. This results in a different *prakriyā* of the forms con-cerned, although the form finally derived is the same. Actually, *Vt*. II is not required, because *yuṣmad* and *asmad* have no gender.

P. 7.1.27 is a asubstitution rule. The item to be replaced is the gen. sg. ending *Ṅas* coming after the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *aŚ*. Examples are *tava svam* 'the property belonging to you' and *mama svam* 'the property belonging to me.' The *prakriyā* of *tava* is provided.

We have three *Vts* on the rule. *Vts* I and II deal with the purpose of the addition of the *anubandha Ś* to *aŚ*. *Vt*. says that the *anubandha* is redundant. Even without this *anubandha* we will understand that the whole of *Nas* is to be deleted, because otherwise there would be no point in stating P. 7.1.27. Against this, *Vt*. II maintains that the *Ś* is purposeful. An important role in the discussion is played by P. 7.2.89, in which the word *anādeśe* 'when not being a substitute' is continued from P. 7.2.86. An example for P. 7.2.89 is *tvayā*. The *prakriyā* is provided. The purpose of *Ś* in *aŚ* is finally sought in this that it prevents the part-substitution of *a* in *Ṅas* by P. 1.1.52.

In connection with *Vt*. II a *Ślokavārttika* is quoted, which was earlier quoted in the *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. V on P. 1.1.20. Here Pāṇini is referrred to as the son of Dākṣī.

Vt. III does not add anything worthwhile to the discussion.

P. 7.1.28 is a substitution rule. The items to be replaced are the sg. dat. case ending *Ṅe* and the nom. and acc. case endings coming after the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *am*. The examples for the sg. dat. are *tubhyam* '(given) to me' and *mahyam* '(given) to me.' The examples for the nom. and acc. endings are *tvam, aham* (sg. nom.), *yuvām, āvām* (du. nom./acc.), *yūyam, vayam* (pl. nom.), and *tvām, mām* (sg. acc.). The *prakriyās* of *tubhyam, aham* and *yuvām* are provided.

In his *bhāṣya* Patañjali raises the question whether *prathamayoḥ* in the rule refers to the nom. and acc. endings of all numbers, or just to *sU* and *am*. The answer is, to the endings concerned of all numbers.

P. 7.1.29 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the pl. acc. ending *Śas* coming after the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *n*. The examples are *yuṣmān* and *asmān* in all three genders.

P. 7.1.30 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the pl. dat. ending *bhyas* coming after the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *bhyam*. The examples quoted are *yuṣmabhyam* '(given) to you (pl.)' and *asmabhyam* '(given) to us).' In the *prakriyā* of *yuṣmabhyam* there is a chance for applying P. 7.3.103, which would result in the undesired form **yuṣmebhyam*. It is explained, how this can be avoided.

In his *bhāṣya* Patañjali raises the question whether the rule prescribes *bhyam* as a substitute, or *abhyam*. In the latter case we can derive the desired form with the desired accent. In the first case, we have to prevent the application of P. 7.1.103. Finally, Patañjali says that it does not matter whether we read *bhyam* or *abhyam* in the rule, because the application of P. 7.1.103 can be prevented by a *pbh*.

P. 7.1.31 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the pl. abl. case ending *bhyas* coming after the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *at*. The examples are *yuṣmat* 'from you (pl.)' and *asmat* 'from us.' The *prakriyā* of *yuṣmat* is provided.

P. 7.1.32 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the sg. abl. ending after the proniminal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *at* again. The examples are *tvat* 'from you (sg.)' and *mat* 'from me.' The *prakriyā* of *tvat* is provided.

P. 7.1.33 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the pl. gen. case ending quoted as *sām* coming after the pronominal stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The substitute is *ākam*. The examples are *yuṣmākam* 'of you (pl.)' and *asmākam* 'of us.'

The big question is, of course, why does the rule say *sāma ākam*, and not *āma ākam*? Tentatively accepting the (non-attested) reading *āma ākam*, it is shown that the pl. gen. forms *yuṣmākam* and *asmākam* can be correctly derived. It is also shown that in this derivation P. 7.1.52, which presupposes *sthānivadbhāva* between *ām* and *ākam*, cannot be applied.

But why *sāmaḥ*? The *KV* explains that the *s* represents the augment *sUṬ*. Then why is *sUṬ* required? The answer, based on *Vt.* VI on the present rule, is that *sUṬ* in *sāmaḥ* is required to remove the augment *sUṬ* applicable by P. 7.1.52 on the (wrong) supposition that *sthānivadbhāva* relation exists between *ām* and *ākam*. The argument is that the *sUṬ* already contained in *sāmaḥ* cancels out the *sUṬ* applicable by P. 7.1.5, so that the combined *sām* is replaced by *ākam*. This is shown with the help of the second *prakriyā* of *yuṣmākam*.

Why *ākam*, and not simply *akam*? The *KV* points out that the long vowel is needed to ensure the application of P. 6.1.101.

We have six *Vts* on the rule. From *Vt* I it is clear that the *Vārttikakāra* knows *sāma ākam* as the reading of P. 7.1.33. All of the *Vts* deal with the purpose of the mention of *s* in *sāmaḥ* in the rule as referring to the augment *sUṬ*. *Vt.* I introduces the idea of *sthānyādeśabhāva* 'the relation of *sthānin* and substitute' between *sām* and *ākam*. *Vt.* II, by referring to *Vt.* I on P. 7.1.102, argues that the *s* in *sāmaḥ* is not required. *Vt.* III says that, still, we have to prohibit *sUṬ*, applicable to *ām* by P. 7.1.52, and thus to *ākam* on the assumption of *sthānyādeśabhāva* between the two. *Vt.* IV refers to the *ṭilopa*-interpretation of P. 7.2.90, for which see under P. 7.1.26. When this interpretation is adopted, there is no possibilitty for applying s*UṬ* by P. 7.1.52. The *Vt.* also says that the *ṭilopa*-interpretation is to be adopted in order to prevent the addition of the fem. suffix *ṬāP* to *yuṣmad / asmad*. *Vt.* V rejects *Vt.* IV on the ground that *yuṣmad* and *asmad* have no gender. Patañjali rejects *Vt.* V and enters into a discussion of gender. The corresponding *bhāṣya* has been translated and explained. *Vt.* VI states the conclusion : *sUṬ* (by P. 7.1.52) must be prohibited. Patañjali mentions an alternative. A prohibition is not required, because we can manage in a different way.

Our conclusion is that the difficulties faced by tradition in interpreting P. 7.1.33 are caused by the assumption of *sthānivadbhāva* between *sām* and *ākam*, which

is itself based on a misinterpretation of the term *analvidhau* in P. 1.1.56.

P. 7.1.34 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the perfect sg. 1st or 3rd person ending *ṆaL*. The substitute is *au*, on the condition that the verbal base concerned ends in long *ā*. Examples are *papau* 'I have / he has drunk' and *jaglau* 'I have felt / he has felt weary.' The *prakriyā* of *jaglau* is provided.

The *bhāṣya* contains a discussion on the order of rule-appplication. First the *au*-substitution should be applied, then *sthānivadbhāva*. Reduplication comes last. But in the *prakriyā* of *jaglau* referred to above a different order is assumed. Priority is given to reduplication, because this is a word-building operation. Thereafter substitution is applied. We distinguish three types of substitution rules.

P. 7.1.35 is an optional substitution rule regarding a particular use of the imp. called *āśis* 'benediction.' No preference is stated. The item to be replaced is *tu* and *hi* of the sg. 3rd and 2nd person imp. The optional substitute is *tātAṄ*. Examples are *jīvatāt* / *jīvatu bhavān* 'may you live, sir' and *jīvatāt* / *jīva tvam* 'may you live.' The *prakriyās* of *jīvatāt* and *jīva* are provided.

The *KV* notes (1) that the *Ṅ* of *tātAṄ* serves to prohibit *guṇavṛddhī*, and (2) that *tātAṄ*, which is *Ṅit*, comes in place of a *sthānin*, which is *Pit*. Two *kārikās* are quoted. They are not dealt with by the *Nyāsa* commentary. According to the *Padamañjarī* they are found in some mss.of the *KV* only. A translation and explanation is provided.

P. 7.1.36 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* coming afther the verbal base *vid-* 'to know.' The substitute is *vasU*. The examples quoted are *vidvān* 'one who knows,' *vidvāṃsau* 'the two who know' and *vidvāṃsaḥ* 'the ones who know.' The *prakriyā* of *vidvān* is provided. The *KV* notes that *vasU* includes the suffix *KvasU* of P. 6.4.131 also.

We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It says that *vasU* added after *vid-* should have been provided with the *anubandha K*. Patañjali rejects the *Vt.*

P. 7.1.37 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the absolutive sufix *Ktvā* coming after a verbal base. The substitute is *LyaP*, on the condition that the form concerned is a cp. the first constituent of which is other than the negative particle.

Before quoting examples provided by the *KV* a general question of derivation is raised. We note that in deriving the form *akṛtvā* 'after not having done' procedure is fairly simple on semantic grounds. First combine *kṛ*- and *Ktvā*, then add the negative particle. But how to proceed in the case of a form like *prakṛtya* 'after having achieved'? Do we first combine *pra* and *kṛ*-, and then add *Ktvā*, or do we first combine *kṛ*- and *Ktvā*, and then add *pra*? The *prakriyā* of *prakṛtya* and a tentative one of *akṛtvā* are provided. It is then concluded that *akṛtvā* is an underivable form in the A. An Excursus on the preverb-verb relation and on cp.-formation is added.

Examples quoted for the rule are *prakṛtya* 'after having achieved,' *pārśvataḥkṛtya* 'after having turned sideways' and *dvidhākṛtya* 'after having made twofold.' Among the counterexamples to show the significance of the word *anañ-pūrva* in the rule is *akṛtvā* 'after not having done, but also *uttamakṛtvā* 'after having done in one's best way.' In the case of the latter counterexample it is assumed that *anañ°* means 'other than *naÑ*,' but, still, the question is, how to justify cp.-formation by P. 2.1.61.

We have seven *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I introduces the idea of *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like an element belonging to the *upadeśa*' for *LyaP*. *Vts*. II states the purpose of doing so, and *Vt*. III states the reason. *Vt*. IV mentions the sub-*gaṇa* *snātvākālakādi*. The cps included do not end in *Ktvā*, so how can they be included under P. 7.1.37? That is explained by *Vts*. V and VI. *Vt*. VII proposes a rephrasing of the rule. Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. VII discusses the meaning of *anaÑ* in *anañ-pūrve* in the rule. Here two *pbhs* (*PN*, *pbhs* 23 and 28) are applicable. The con-clusion is that only what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 23 should be applied. The discussion is summed up by a *kārikā* consisting of two *ślokas*.

P. 7.1.38 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. It is noted that here *ktvā* also (and not *LyaP*) comes after a verbal base, given a cp. in which *naÑ* is not the first member. The *KV* raises the question, why hasn't the rule been phrased as *vā chandasi* 'optionally in the Vedic language'? The reason stated is that this has not been done in order to indicate that all restrictions on the use of *Ktvā* in the Vedas have been relaxed.

P. 7.1.39 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. The items to be replaced are the endings called *sUP*. The substitutes, twelve in all, including *luk*-deletion, are enumerated. The *KV* quotes examples for each category enumerated. The rule provides a good example for the way in which Pāṇini views the language of the Vedas.

P. 7.1.40 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. The item to be replaced is the 1st person sg. ending *am* (P. 3.4.101). The substitute is *mAŚ*. An example quoted by the *KV* is *vadhīṃ vṛtram* 'I killed Indra.' The *prakriyā* of *vadhīm* is provided.

P. 7.1.41 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. The item to be replaced is *t* belonging to *ātm.* endings. The substitute is *lopa*. Examples are *aduhra* 'they milked,' where *t* is deleted and *rUT* (P. 7.1.8) is added, and *duhām* '(the cow) should give milk.' The corresponding Sanskrit form of *duhām* is *dugdhām*. The *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.42 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. The item to be replaced is the pl. 2nd. imp. *ātm.* ending *dhvam*. The substitute is *dhvāt*. The example is *vārayadhvāt* 'you (pl.) must cover.' The *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.43 is a *nipātana* rule dealing with Vedic usage. The word *iti* in the rule is used to refer to a wordform. The expression noted reads *yajadhvainam* 'you (pl.) must sacrifice to him.' The *KV* explains that *lopa* has taken place of *m* in *yajadhvam*, when directly followed by *enam*, and that, moreover, *y* comes in place of *v*. Apparently, the *KV* reads *yajadhyainam* instead of *yajadhvainam*, but this reading cannot be justified.

P. 7.1.44 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. The item to be replaced is the pl. 2nd *par.* imp. ending *ta*. The substitute is *tāt*. An example is *kṛṇutāt* 'you (pl.) must cut off.' The *prakriyā* is provided. Traditionally, the non-application of *guṇa* (by P. 7.3.86) to the penultimate vowel of the verbal base is explained as being due to *sthānivattva* of *lopa*, namely, of the substitute vowel *a* by P. 3.1.80. Thus, apart from having a positive function, *sthānivadbhāva* is assumed to have a negative function also. We have rejected this dual function of *sthānivad-bhāva*.

P. 7.1.45 is a substitution rule regarding the Vedic language. The item to be replaced is the.pl. 2nd *par.* imp. ending *ta* again. The substitutes are *taP*, *tanaP*, *tana* and *thana*. The function of the *anubandha P* is to allow *guṇa* by P. 7.3.84. Examples are *śṛṇota* 'you (pl.) must hear,' *dadhātana* 'you (pl.) must fasten,' *jujuṣṭana* 'you (pl.), be pleased' and *iṣṭhana* 'you (pl.) must desire.'

P. 7.1.46 notes that in the Vedic language we find *masI* which ends in *iT*. The rule does not indicate a *sthānin*, but it is fairly obvious that the *sthānin* is the pl. first person ending *mas*. The *i* added in *masI* is regarded as an augment. We

note that a vowel may be added to prevent the deletion of the final consonant of a suffix. An example is *uddīpayāmasi* 'we kindle.'

P. 7.1.47 is an augment rule regarding the Vedic language. The augment is *yaK*. It is added to the absolutive suffix *Ktvā*. An example is *dattvāya* 'after having granted.'

P. 7.1.48 is a *nipātana* rule dealing with a Vedic absolutive. Like in P. 7.4.43, the word *iti* is usred to refer to a wordform. The expression reads *iṣṭvīnam* 'after having sacrificed.' The *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.49 is a *nipātana* rule dealing with Vedic absolutive formation. The expresions noted are *snātvī* 'after having taken bath,' etc., an *ākṛtigaṇa* 'sample list.'

P. 7.1.50 is an augment rule dealing with the Vedic language. The augment is *asUK*. It is added to the pl. nom. case ending *Jas*. Example are *brāhmaṇāsaḥ* 'the brahmins' and *pūrvāsaḥ* 'the earlier ones.'

The latter example gives rise to a discussion regarding conflict procedure. *Pūrva* is a pronominal adjective. Therefore *Jas* can be replaced by *Śī* by P. 7.1.17. The question now is, which rule to apply first, P. 7.1.17, or P. 7.1.50. The traditional answer is, P. 7.1.50, because it is the *para* 'later' rule. Reference is to P. 1.4.2. Here, after the application of P. 7.1.50, the other rule, P. 7.1.17, becomes applicable again. Then what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 39 is invoked to block the re-application.

Patañjali, in his *bhāṣya* on the rule, raises the question, what exactly is the *aṅga* understood by the rule. According to the wording of P. 7.1.50, the derivational order of elements is *aṅga* + (*Jas* + *asUK*). But Patañjali wants to change that order into (*aṅga* + *asUK*) + *Jas*. This amounts to a rephrasing of P. 7.1.50. But since this leads him into difficulties, Patañjali proposes another rephrasing, in which the rule does not say *asUK*, but *asUṬ*. Finally, Patañjali rejects both rephrasings, and says that the rule must remain as it is. Another solution is to refer to the maxim *dṛṣṭānuvidhiś chandasi* 'see the Vedic form, and then apply the rule accordingly.'

P. 7.1.51 is an augment rule. The augment is *asUK*. It is added to four nominal stems, *aśva* 'stallion,' *kṣīra* 'milk,' *vṛṣa* 'bull' and *lavaṇa* 'salt,' when the suffix *KyaC* is used to form a denominative in the sense of desiring eagerly. The examples are *aśvasyati* 'lusts for the stallion,' (said of a mare), *vṛṣasyati* 'lusts for the bull' (said of a cow), *kṣīrasyati* 'has a craving for milk' and *lavaṇasyati* 'craves salt' (said of a camel). The *prakriyā* of *vṛṣasyati* is provided.

We have two *Vts* and two *Vt.*-like statement on the rule. The *Vts* and the first *Vt.*-like statement further specify the meaning of the suffix *KyaC*. The second *Vt.*-like statement introduces the augment *sUK* in denominative formations. The examples are *dadhiṣyati* 'he craves *dadhi*' and *madhuṣyati* 'he craves honey.'

P. 7.1.52 is an augment rule. The augment is *sUṬ*. It is prefixed to the pl. gen. case ending *ām* coming after a pronominal stem ending in *a*. Examples are *sarveṣām* 'of all,' *yeṣām* 'of those who / which,' (masc. / ntr.) *teṣām* 'of those,' (masc. / ntr.) *yāsām* 'of those who / which' (fem.) and *tāsām* 'of those' (fem.).

The *KV* points out that P. 7.3.116 mentions a similar suffix *ām* as the substitute for the sg. loc. ending after fem. stems. The argument has nothing to do with the augment *sUṬ*, but centres on the augment *nUṬ* prescribed by P. 7.1.54. For instance, by P. 7.3.116 we derive the stage *nadī* + *ām*. Here P. 7.3.112 becomes applicable for the augment *āṬ*. That gives us *nadī* + *āṬ* + *ām*. Now the question is, why not first insert *nUṬ*, before adding *āṬ*? Unfortunately, once *nUṬ* has been inserted, we cannot add *āṬ* any more, because *nUṬ* intervenes between the stem and the case ending. Thus we have a conflict. Tradition solves it by invoking the *para*-principle (P. 1.4.2). Thereby *āṬ* prevails. The solution is wrong. See *AP* IV, p. 18. The correct solution is to apply the *utsarga-apavāda* principle. See *AP* IV, p. 19-20. P. 7.3.112 is a special rule in relation to P. 7.3.116. Therefore it prevails.

We have a *bhāṣya* on the rule. Here Patañjali observes that there are many *āms* in the A., and then goes to great lengths why these other *āms* are not included in the *ām* mentioned in P. 7.1.52.

P. 7.1.53 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the stem *tri* 'three,' provided that the pl. gen. case ending *ām* follows. The substitute is *traya*. The example is *trayāṇām* 'of three.' The *KV* notes that the form *trīṇām* also is found in the Vedic language.

P. 7.1.54 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUṬ*. It is prefixed to the pl. gen. case ending *ām* in three cases, (1) the stem must end in a short vowel, (2) the stem must be called *nadī*, and (3) the stem must end in a fem. suffx indicated as *āP*. Examples are *vṛkṣāṇām* 'of the trees,' *kartṝṇām* 'of the agents,' *kumārīṇām* of the young girls,' *mālānām* 'of garlands' and *kārīṣagandhyānām* 'of female descendants of Karīṣagandhi.'

P. 7.1.55 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUṬ*. It is prefixed to the pl. gen. case ending *ām* coming after the stems called *ṣaṣ* and after *catur* 'four.'

Examples are *pañcānām* 'of five,' *ṣaṇṇām* 'of six,' *navānām* 'of nine' and *caturṇām* 'of four.' According to the *KV*, the rule applies also to cps formed with *ṣaṣ*-numerals and with *catur*, if the numeral is the main member of the cp. Examples are *paramaṣaṇṇām* 'of the highest six' and *paramacaturṇām* 'of the highest four.' On the other hand, if the numeral is the subordinate cp. member, *nUṬ* is not added. An example is *priyaṣaṣām* 'of ones to whom six are dear.'

P. 7.1.56 is a augment rule dealing with the Vedic language. The augment is *nUṬ*. It is prefixed to the pl. gen. case ending *ām* coming after *śrī* 'wealth' and *grāmaṇī* 'village headman.' The examples are *śrīṇām* 'of wealth' and *grāmaṇīnām* 'of village headmen.'

The *KV* thinks that the designation *nadī* is optionally (*vā*) applied to *śrī* by P. 1.4.5, and that, therefore, in the *bhāṣā* we have the choice between *śrīṇām* and *śriyām*. This opinion is based on a misunderstanding of the option words in the A. In P. 1.4.5 the negation *na* is continued from P. 1.4.4. *Na vā* means *vibhāṣā* 'better not.' Therefore the preferred form is *śriyām*.

The Vedic pl. gen. cp. form *sūtagrāmaṇīnām* gives rise to a discussion on the formation of the cp. We can derive it as an *itaretaradvandva* cp. in the sense of 'of charioteers and village headmen.' Here the cp. stem ends in long *ī*. Therefore we cannot apply the insertion of *nUT* by P. 7.1.54. A special rule is needed, namely, P. 7.1.56. But, suppose, we derive it as an *ekaśeṣa* form of a neuter *samāhāradvandva* in the sense of 'the group of charioteers and village headmen.' The point of this farfetched derivation is that now the cp. stem *sūtagrāmaṇi* ends in a short vowel. Therefore P. 7.1.54 is applicable, and we can do without at least part of the present rule. The discussion goes back to Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on P. 7.1.56.

P. 7.1.57 is an augment rule dealing with the Vedic language. The augment is *nUṬ*. It is prefixed to the pl. gen. case ending *ām* coming after the stem *go* 'bull/cow,' when occurring at the end of a quarter verse. The example is *gonām* 'of cattle.' But since in the Vedic language all rules are optional, the form *gavām* can also be justified.

P. 7.1.58 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted after the last vowel of a verbal base marked with *I* in the *Dhp*. Examples are *kuṇḍitā* 'one who burns,' *kuṇḍitum* 'in order to burn,' *huṇḍitavyam* 'what has to be collected together' and *huṇḍā* 'collection.'

The *KV*, referring to *Vt.* I on the rule, says that *nUM* is already inserted in the *upadeśa* stage of the verbal base, before grammatical operations are applied. Thus, even the verbal base is mentioned without *nUM* in the *Dhp.*, it must be regarded as containing *nUM*. Examples are *kuṇḍā* 'the burning' and *huṇḍā* 'collection,' derived from the verbal bases *kuḍI-* and *huḍI-* which have been mentioned in the *Dhp.* without *nUM*. The point is that P. 3.3.103, which prescribes the *kṛt* suffix *a* after a verbal base ending in a consonant, requires a *guru* vowel of the verbal base for its application, as in *ku-nUM-ḍ + a + ṬāP*.

The question why the word *dhātoḥ* has been mentioned in the rule gives rise to a lengthy discussion. The *KV* first says that its purpose is to ensure the addition of *nUM* at the *upadeśa* stage of the verbal base concerned. But then another purpose is suggested, namely, that *dhātoḥ* has been mentioned to prevent the addition of *nUM* as a result of the fact that *tāsI*, the marker of the periphrastic future, and *sIC*, the marker of the aor., have been provided with short *i*. The question implied is whether this *i* is the *anubandha I*. If so, it would lead to an *iditkārya* 'a grammatical operation based on short *i* as an *it*-letter.'

Now, suppose that *tāsI* and *sIC* are *anidit* 'not marked with *i* as an it-letter.' That leads to difficulties in two cases. One is the sg. 3rd person aor. form *amaṃsta* 'he thought.' The other is the sg. 3rd person periphrastic future form *mantā* 'he will think.' The difficulty here is that in the *prakriyā* the final *n* of the verbal base will be deleted by P. 6.4.24. In the case of the aor. form the difficulty is removed by assuming that *n* before *sIC* is not deleted on the ground of a clue provided by P. 1.2.14. As regards *mantā*, we will say that the deletion of *n* by P. 6.4.24 is not applied, because *ṭilopa* prescribed by P. 6.4.143 is *asiddha* in respect of P. 6.4.24, by P. 6.4.22. The conclusion is that the *i* of *tāsI* and *sIC* is not meant for an *iditkārya* at all. The only purpose of the mention of *dhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.58 is that *nUM* should be inserted in the *upadeśa* stage of the *dhātu*. We note that this discussion on *aniditva* of *tāsI* and *sIC* finds no mention in the *Vts* and the *bhāṣya* on P. 7.1.58.

Another question is, why isn't *nUM* inserted in *bhettā* 'he will break' and *chettā* 'he will cut up'? The answer is that the two verbal bases concerned have been mentioned in the *Dhp.* as *bhidIR* and *chidIR*. They are, therefore, not *idit*, but *irit*.

We have four *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that *nUM* is *upadeśivat* '(treated) like an *upadeśa* element,' as far as the application of suffixes is concerned. *Vts.* II and III point out undesired consequences, if *nUM* is not *upadeśivat*. *Vt.* IV deals with the purpose of the word *dhātoḥ* in the rule. The purpose is to ensure that *nUM*

is inserted as soon as the designation *dhātu* P. 1.3.1) applies, that is, in the *upadeśa* stage.

P. 7.1.59 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in the verbal bases beginning with *muc-* 'to release,' provided that the *vikaraṇa Śa* (P. 3.1.77) follows immediately. Examples are *muñcati* 'he releases,' *vindati* 'he finds,' *limpati* 'he smears', *kṛntati* 'he cuts' and *piṃśati* 'he carves.'

We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I mentions the *tṛmphādi-gaṇa*, which contains ten verbal bases enumerated in pairs of two. These verbal bases take the augment *nUM*, if *Śa* follows. *Vt.* II states the reason for the phrasing of *Vt.* I. The reason is that in the *Dhp*. the verbal bases included in the *gaṇa* have been mentioned with a prefinal *n*, and that this *n* is deleted by P. 6.4.24. Therefore, to have *n* again, a special prescription of *nUM* is required.

P. 7.1.60 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in the verbal bases *masj-* 'to plunge into' and *naś-* 'to perish,' provided that a suffix beginning with a consonant except nasals and semivolwels follows immediately. Examples are *maṅktā* 'one who plunges into,' *maṅktum* 'in order to plunge into,' *naṃṣṭum* 'in order to perish' and *naṃṣṭavyam* 'that which has to perish.' The *prakriyā* of *manktā* is provided.

The *KV* quotes *Vt.* II on P. 1.1.47. The *Vt.* says that, according to teachers of grammar, *nUM* should be inserted before the last sound of *masji-*. Tradition applies this *Vt.* in all derivations of *masj-* where *nUM* is involved. The examples are the sg. nom. masc. forms *magnaḥ* 'one plunged into' and *magnavān* 'one who has plunged into.' The *prakriyā* of *magna* is provided.

P. 7.1.61 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in the verbal bases *radhi* 'to subdue' and *jabh-* 'to open the jaws wide,' provided that a suffix beginning with a vowel follows immediately. Examples are *randhayati* 'he causes to subdue,' *randhakaḥ* 'one who subdues' (sg. nom. masc.), *sādhujambhī* 'one who is habituated to open the jaws well,' *jambhaṃjambham* 'after having opened the jaws repeatedly' and *jambho vartate* 'opening of the jaws takes place.' In these formations *vṛddhi* of the verbal base vowel by P. 7.2.116 is not applied. According to the *KV*, *vṛddhi* is blocked by *nUM* by the present rule, because this rule is *nitya* 'invariably applicable.' Being *nitya*, P. 7.1.61 prevails over P. 7.2.116. Once *nUM* is applied, P. 7.2.116 cannot become applicable any more. In fact, *vṛddhi* is not applied, because *nUM* changes the environment of the *vṛddhi* rule.

P. 7.1.62 prohibits the insertion of the augment *nUM* for *radhi* 'to subdue,' if a suffix which takes *iṬ* (by P. 7.2.35), and which is not *lIṬ* is added. Examples are *radhitā* 'one who subdues', *radhitum* 'in order to subdue' and *radhitavyam* 'what has to be subdued.'

The *KV* notes that, once *nUM* has been inserted, the *lIṬ* endings are no longer *Kit* - reference is to P. 1.2.5 - because now *randh-* ends in consonant group. Consequently, the deletion of *n* by P. 6.4.24 cannot take place. Precisely to allow that deletion the *anubandha K* has been added to the pf. act. participle suffix *KvasU*. The example is *redhivān* 'having subdued' (sg. nom. masc.). The *prakriyā*, in which P. 6.4.120 is applied, has been provided. Once *nUM* is applied, the (modified) verbal base becomes *rendh*, ending in a consonant group. Therefore it cannot be *Kit*, and, as a result, *nUM* cannot be deleted by P. 6.4.24. But since *KvasU* is manifestly *Kit*, *nUM* is deleted.

Taking its cue from Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the rule, the *KV* raises the question why the rule has not been phrased as a *niyama* 'restrictive rule.' In a *niyama* it all depends on the position of the restrictive word *eva*. Suppose, we put *eva* after *liṭi*. That results in the phrasing of the *niyama* as *iṭi liṭy eva* 'if (*nUM* is applied at all before a suffix beginning with) *iṬ*, (then) only in the case of *lIṬ* endings (not elsewhere).' In that case, we can justify the forms *rarandhiva* 'the two of us have subdued' and *rarandhima* 'we have subdued', because here the pf. endings begin with *iṬ*. The answer given by the *KV* is that a *niyama* could also be phrased by putting *eva* after *iṭi*, with undesired results. Therefore better leave the rule as it is.

There is a *bhāṣya* on the rule. Here Patañjali notes that the rule contains two negations. His idea is that the two negations can be done away with by interpreting the rule as a *niyama*.

P. 7.1.63 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in the verbal base *rabh-* 'to act with force,' provided that a suffix follows which begins with a vowel, except before *ŚaP* or *lIṬ*. The examples are *ārambhayati* 'he undertakes,' *ārambhakaḥ* 'one who undertakes,' *sādhvārambhī* 'one who is habituated to undertake well,' *ārambhamārambham* 'after having undertaken repeatedly' and *ārambho vartate* 'undertaking takes place.'

P. 7.1.64 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in the verbal base *labh-* 'to take hold of,' provided that a suffix beginning with a vowel follows immediately, except before *ŚaP* or *lIṬ*. The examples are *lambhayati* 'he

causes to take hold of,' *lambhakaḥ* 'one who takes hold of,' *sādhulambī* 'one who is habituated to take hold of well,' *lambhaṃlambham* 'after having taken hold of repeatedly' and *lambho vartate* 'taking hold of takes place.'

P. 7.1.65 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in *labh-* 'to take hold of,' when preceded by the preverb *āṄ*, provided that a suffix is applied which begins with *y*. The form *yi* stated in the rule is traditionally taken to be a *viṣayasaptamī*. This implies that for operations to take place the presence of the suffix concerned is not required. The suffix may be added at a later stage. It is noted that this traditional assumption can be taken care of by the extended version of the *siddha*-principle See P. 7.1.23, under 6 and 7.

The *KV*, following Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the rule, raises the question of acentuation. If *nUM* is inserted in *labh* - before the suffix is added, the position will be *lambh*. Here the verbal base vowel is no longer in prefinal position. As a result, we cannot add the suffix *yaT* (P. 3.1.97), but, to arrive at the form *ālambhyā* (as in *ālambhyā gauḥ* 'a cow which is to be taken hold of'), we have to apply the suffix *ṆyaT* (P. 3.1.124). This will give us the desired accent. On the other hand, if the suffix is added before *nUM* is inserted, we can use *yaT*. But that will result in the wrong accentuation.

We have a *bhāṣya* on the rule. Patañjali solves the difficulty of the stage in which *nUM* is to be added by stating that *nUM* has already been inserted in the *upadeśa* stage of *labh-*. Thus, for all practical purposes, *labh-* is *lambh-*. Consequently, only the suffix *ṆyaT* can be applied, which gives us the desired accentuation.

P. 7.1.66 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in *labh-* 'to take hold of,' preceded by the preverb *upa*, provided that a suffix follows which begins with *y*, if the sense of praise is conveyed. An example is *upalambhyā bhavatā vidyā* 'knowledge is to be acquired by you, sir.'

P. 7.1.67 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in *labh-* 'to take hold of,' preceded by a preverb, provided that the suffix *KHaL* or *GHaÑ* follows immediately. Examples are (for *KHaL*) *supralambhaḥ* 'easy to be deceived' (sg. nom. masc.), and (for *GHaÑ*) *vipralambhaḥ* 'deceit.'

The *KV* argues that we could have managed already, namely, by P. 7.1.64, and that, therefore, P. 7.1.67 must be regarded as a *niyama* 'restrictive rule.'

P. 7.1.68 is prohibits the insertion of the augment *nUM* for *labh-* 'to take hold of,' preceded by the preverbs (*upasargas*) *su* 'easy' and *dus* 'difficult' alone, when the suffix *KHaL* or *GHaÑ* follows immediately. Examples are (for *KHaL*) *sudurlabham* 'very difficult to obtain,' and (for *GHaÑ*) *sulābhaḥ* 'an easy gain.' In the translation the form *sudurbhyām* is taken as a technical abl. which requires immediate sequence.

We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It says that the word *kevalābhyām* has been mentioned in the rule in connection with *su* and *dus* to prevent other preverbs coming before or after *su* or *dus*. Patañjali first provides the counterexample *prasulambham*. But the sequence *prasu*° goes against Sanskrit usage. The better counterexample is *supralambham* 'easy to be deceived' (sg. nom. ntr.). Here, however, we have a difficulty, if *sudurbhyām* is taken as a technical. abl. which requires immediate sequence of *su* / *dus* and *labh-*. In the counterexample this requirement is not met, because *pra* intervenes between *su* and *lambham*. Therefore we cannot prevent *nUM* from being inserted by the present rule. After having offered and rejected still another counterexample Patañjali returns to *supralambham*. To get rid of the difficulty of immediate sequence mentioned above, he proposes to interpret the form *sudurbhyām* in the rule as a du. instr. This is also what the *KV* does.

P. 7.1.69 optionally prescribes the augment *nUM* for *labh-*, if the pass. 3rd person aor. is formed, or if the suffix *ṆamUL* follows immediately. The option word in the rule is *vibhāṣā*. We have continued *na* from P. 7.1.68. *Na vibhāṣā* means *vā* 'preferably.' The *KV*, however, does not continue *na*. The examples are (for the aor. form) *alābhi* / *alambhi* 'it was taken hold of,' and (for *ṆamUL*) *lābhaṃlābham*/ *lambhaṃlambham* 'after having repeatedly taken hold of.' Here the preferred forms (in our interpretation) are the *nUM*-forms.

We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It wants to add the word *anupasṛṣṭasya* 'of (*labhi*) when not preceded by a preverb.' Patañjali rejects the *Vt.* by tricky reasoning. But it is better kept as it is.

P. 7.1.70 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in any stem which is not a verbal base and which is *ugit* 'provided with an *anubandha* included in the *pratyāhāra uK*,' and in the verbal base *añc-* 'to bend,' if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. Examples are (for *ugit* forms) *bhavān* 'you, sir,' *śreyān* 'the better one' (sg. nom. masc.), *pacan* 'one who cooks' (sg. nom. masc.). In the latter two forms the suffixes *Ī̆yasUN* and *ŚatṚ* are applied. An example for *añc-* is *prāṅ* 'the eastern one' (sg. nom. masc.). The *prakriyā* of *prāṅ* is provided.

According to the *KV* following Patañjali, the mention of *añc-* in the rule is for the sake of restriction (*niyama*). The restriction is phrased as *añcater eva dhātor anyatra mā bhūt* '(*nUM* becomes part) of the verbal base *añc-* only, so that it is not inserted elsewhere,' that is, in other verbal bases. One example, borrowed from Patañjali, is *ukhāsrat* 'one who drops (something) into the boiling pan' (sg. nom. masc.). The corresponding *prakriyā* is provided. On account of the restriction *nUM* is not inserted in the verbal base *sraṃs-*.

We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It points out that we can do without the word *adhātoḥ* in the rule. Patañjali disagrees. He argues that the mention of *adhātoḥ* is meant to give us a clue. The clue is that the mention of *añc-* has a restrictive character. It means *añc-* only. Then, since other verbal bases are excluded, why state *adhātoḥ*? The answer is that the restriction narrows down the field to original verbal bases, to the exclusion of denominatives. The example is *gomatyati* 'he wants one possessing cattle for himself.' The basis for the denominative form is the nominal *gomat*, a *matUP* formation, and, therefore, *ugit*. The *prakriyā* of *gomat* as a denominative verbal base is provided.

P. 7.1.71 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in the verbal base *yuj-* 'to yoke,' provided that a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately, except if *yuj* is part of a cp. Examples are *yuṅ* 'one who yokes' and *yuñjaḥ* 'ones who yoke.' The *prakriyā* of *yuṅ* is provided. A counterexample is *aśvayuj* 'one who yokes horses.' The corresponding *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.72 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in a neuter stem ending in a consonant except nasal and semivowels or in a vowel, provided that a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. Examples are (for neuter stems ending in a non-nasal consonant) *udaśvinti* 'quantities of buttermilk' and *yaśāṃsi* 'famous deeds,' and (for neuter stems ending in a vowel) *kuṇḍāni* 'pitchers' and *trapūṇi* 'tin objects.'

We have five *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that a prohibition of *nUM* by P. 7.1.70 should be stated. One example provided by Patañjali is *gomanti brāhmaṇakulāni* 'brahmin families who possess cattle.' In the derivation of *gomanti* it is shown that both P. 7.1.70 and 72 become applicable. The result of their application would be that *nUM* may appear twice. The *Vārttikakāra* does not want that, but Patañjali thinks that there is no harm in applying both rules. Between the two rules no *bādhya-bādhaka* relation can be established in the sense that one of them is the *apavāda* of the other. Anyway, we won't hear the difference between a sequence of *n* twice and a single *n*. Therefore, according to Patañjali, *Vt.* I is not required.

A difference is noted between the views of Kātyāyana and Patañjali on the relation between a general rule (*utsarga*) and a special rule (*apavā*da).

Vt. II refers to the *para*-principle (P. 1.4.2) to solve the conflict between P. 7.1.70 and 72. Since we have rejected this principle, we will say that the rule which contains an *aupadeśika* element should prevail. That rule is P. 7.1.70, which is conditioned by *ugit*. *Vt.* III contains an implicit reference to what has become *PN*, *pbhs* 39 and 40. The first *pbh.* allows the re-application of an earlier rule after it has been superseded by a later rule. Thus P. 7.1.70 could be applied again after the application of P. 7.1.72, resulting in the double *n*. The second *pbh.* denies that. *Vt.* IV contains the example *bahūrji* 'having much vigour' (pl. nom. / acc. ntr.). It says that in this case a prohibition of *nUM* is to be phrased. The *prakriyā* of *bahūrji* is provided. *Vt.* V says that, according to some teachers, *nUM* should be inserted before the final phoneme. The resulting form is *bahūrnji*.

P. 7.1.73 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in neuter stem ending in an *iK* vowel, provided that a case ending follows which begins with a vowel. Examples are the ntr. du. nom. / acc. forms *trapuṇī* 'the two tin objects' and *tumburuṇī* 'the two coriander seeds, and the sg. dat. forms *trapuṇe* 'for tin' and *tumburuṇe* 'for a coriander seed.'

In the *KV* an argument follows which is based on the *Ślokavārttikas* quoted in the *bhāṣya* on the rule. The question is, why has the word *aci* 'provided that a case ending which begins with a vowel' been stated in the rule? Following the second part of the last line of *Ślokavt.* ii, the *KV* says that the only purpose that can be assigned to the mention of *aci* in P. 7.1.73 is that it is required to derive the ntr. sg. voc. The example is *he trapo* 'o piece of tin.' But then the *KV* argues that for this purpose we don't need *aci*. We can manage by P. 8.2.7. It is, however, pointed out that we also have P. 8.2.8, which prohibits the deletion (*lopa*) of *n* in final position of a nominal stem before the sg. voc. The purpose of *aci* is precisely to undo the prohibition. Against this, an objection is raised. Finally, the *KV*, following Patañjali, says that *aci* has been mentioned to give us a clue, namely, that P. 1.1.63 does not apply when the question is of a sg. voc.

We have three *Vts* on the rule and two *Ślokavārttikas*. The *bhāṣya* starts with the *Ślokavārttikas*. The statements of the *Ślokavārttikas* are so much condensed that they cannot be summarized without an extensive explanation. For that we refer to the main text. Two points may, however, noted. One is the first line of *Ślokavārttika* ii. It says that the substitution of *tisr* for *tri* can go ahead, even if *nUM* intervenes. One example quoted by Patañjali is the *bv.* cp. *priyatisṛbhyām* 'by the

two persons to whom three females are dear.' Here two rules become applicable, P. 7.1.73 for *nUM*, and P. 7.2.99 for the *tisṛ*-substitution. Applying the *para*-principle (P. 1.4.2), Patañjali argues that P. 7.2.99, which is the later rule, prevails. However, after the application of P. 7.2.99 the other rule, P. 7.1.73, is still applicable. The question, therefore, is whether to accept *punaḥprasaṅga* 're-applicability,' of P. 7.1.73, or not. To reject *punaḥprasaṅga*, *PN*, *pbh*. 40 is invoked. But, apparently, this is not what the *Vārttikakāra* means. The question phrased by the *Nyāsa* is, how can the *Ślokavārttikakāra* tell us to go ahead with the substitution of *tisṛ* for *tri*, when *nUM* intervenes? The answer is, by adopting the *vihitaviśeṣaṇa*-view. In this view the mention of *aci* in the rule is not required. To explain what *vihitaviśeṣaṇa* entails, an Excursus is inserted. The other point to be noted in *Ślokavārttika* ii is the last line, which contains the answer to the question about the purpose of the word *aci* in P. 7.1.73. See below, after the discussion of the *Vts*.

The *Vts* contain the answer to and the part-refutation of the *Ślokavārttikas*. According to *Vt*. I, the word *aci* in the rule is required, namely, to ensure that between *nUM* (by P. 7.1.73) and *nUT* (by P. 7.1.54) a conflict obtains. Reference is to *Vt*. XI on P. 7.1.96. This *Vt*. tells us that *nUT* prevails over *nUM*, apparently by *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict procedure in which the earlier rule prevails.' The idea of *Vt*. I on P. 7.1.73 is that *vipratiṣedha* 'conflict' here is only possible, if *aci* is stated in this rule. If *aci* is there, then after the insertion of *nUṬ* by P. 7.1.54 there is no chance for applying P. 7.1.73, because the following case ending is not an *aj-ādi vibhakti* any more.

Since we have rejected both *pūrva-* and *paravipratiṣedha*, the question for us is, how to justify the prevalence of *nUṬ* over *nUM*, because both the rules concerned are word-building rules. The answer is that in a two-way conflict we have recourse to the *utsarga-apavāda* principle We will regard the *nUṬ*-rule as the special rule in relation to the *nUM*-rule. Therefore it prevails.

Vt. II states the reason for *Vt*. I. *Vt*. III says that *aci* has also been mentioned in P. 7.1.73, because it is required in a following rule. That rule is P. 7.1.75, which says that *anAṄ* is substituted for the stem final of *asthi* 'bone,' if a case ending beginning with a vowel (*aci*) follows. The *prakriyās* of *asthnā* 'by means of a bone' and of the undesired form **asthabhyām* are provided.

Finally, the second part of the second line of *Ślokavārttika* ii informs us that the purpose of the mention of *aci* in P. 7.1.73 lies in the derivation of the ntr. sg. voc. The example is *he trapo* 'o piece of tin.' The *prakriyā* is provided. For the rather complicated argument see the main text.

P. 7.1.74 records the opinion of Gālava, a pre-pāṇinian grammarian. The rule prescribes the treatment of an (adjectival) ntr. stem ending in an *iK*-vowel like a masc., if case endings from the instr. onwards which begin with a vowel follow immediately. The term used for such treatment is *puṃvat*. The rule also stipulates that for the ntr. stem a corresponding masc. form must be available in the same meaning. The term used in this connection is *bhāṣitapuṃska*. The term was earlier used in P. 6.3.34. In distinction from its earlier use, the word *bhāṣitapuṃska* in the present rule refers to independent adjectival words, not forming part of a cp. or *taddhita* formation.

A rule in which the name of a teacher is mentioned is traditionally regarded as optional. In the present case, the option is between *puṃvadbhāva* 'treatment like a masc.' and non-*puṃvadbhāva*. When *puṃvadbhāva* is not applied, *nUM* is aplied by P. 7.1.73, and shortening of the final stem vowel in the ntr. by P. 1.2.47. Accordingly, the examples quoted for the rule by the *KV* are divided into two groups.

The *Nyāsa* explains that *puṃvat* does not mean a transference or extension of grammatical operations applicable to masc. stems, but the non-transference of operations which are applicable to ntr. stems only. P. 7.1.74, therefore, transfers a prohibition. The operations concerned are four. They have been prescribed by P. 7.1.54 (*nUṬ*), P. 7.3.111 (*guṇa*), P. 7.3.119 (*auṬ*) and P. 7.3.120 (*nā*). See *Vt*. I on the present rule.

Examples quoted by the *KV* are first of adjectival stems ending in long *Ī*, subdivided according to case endings, like for the sg. instr. *grāmaṇyā / grāmaṇinā brāhmaṇakulena* 'by a brahmin family who is the head of a village, for the pl. gen. *grāmaṇyām / grāmaṇīnām brāhmaṇakulānām* 'of the brahmin families who are . . .' and for the sg. loc. *grāmaṇyām / grāmaṇini brāhmanakule* 'in a brahmin family who is . . .' Next are examples for stems ending is short *i*, like for the sg. dat. *śucaye / śucine brāhmaṇakulāya* 'to a pure brahmin family,' for the sg. abl. *śucer / śucino brāhmaṇakulāt* 'from a pure brahmin family,' and for the du. gen. *śucyor / śucinor brāhmaṇakulayoḥ* 'of the two pure brahmin families,' for the sg. loc. *śucau / śucini brāhmaṇakule* 'in a pure brahmin family.' In the *puṃvadbhāva* examples the four operations mentioned are applicable. The non-*puṃvadbhāva* examples show an inserted *n*.

Referring to *Vts* IV and V on the rule, the *KV* raises the question why the present rule does not apply to the sg. dat. form *pīlune* in *pīlune phalāya* 'for a *pīlu* fruit.' The difficulty is that we only have the ntr. form. not the corresponding masc.

form *pīlave*. The word *pīlu* is known in the sense of a particular tree and in that of the fruit of that tree. The answer is that *puṃvadbhāva* is of that form which has a common *ākṛti*, that is, the same *pravṛttinimitta* as the ntr. form. The point is that the ntr. word *pīlu* has a different *pravṛttinimitta* from that of the masc. word *pīlu*, namely, *phalatva* 'being a fruit' as different from *vṛkṣatva* 'being a tree.' Consequently, *pīlu* is not a *bhāṣitapuṃska* word.

In his introductory *bhāṣya* to the *Vṭs* Patañjali puts the question, what exactly is transferred or extended by the present rule? The answer is, the prohibition of *nUM* for ntr. stems. The assumption is that the transference meant is of a grammatical operation. We note that, in fact, there is no rule in the A. which prescribes a grammatical operation for masc. stems only, with one exception, namely, P. 6.1.103. This rule applies in the case of the pl. acc case ending *Śas* in the masc. v̄hich cannot be included in *tṛtīyādi vibhakati*.

We have five *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that, if by the word *puṃvat* a prohibition of *nUM* (by P. 7.1.73) only is meant, then a prohibition should also be added of *guṇa* (P. 7.3.111), *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.154) and *auṬ* (P. 7.3.119). *Vt*. II says that P. 7.1.74 also prohibits shortening of the final vowel (P. 1.2.47), namely, when *puṃvadbhāva* is applied. Thus the final *ī* of *grāmaṇī* is retained, and *yaṆ-ādeśa* is applied before case endings beginning with a vowel. *Vt*. III literally repeats *Vt*. III on P. 1.2.58. It implies that *Vts* I and II are not required, and says that we can manage on account of *arthātideśa*. Here the word *artha* refers to gender. Accordingly, we translate *arthātideśa* as 'transference / extension of gender.' Thereby *puṃvat* is interpreted to mean that, instead of ntr. gendcr operations, masc. gender operations are applied to a *bhāṣitapuṃska* word. Thereby also we need not phrase separate prohibitions, like the ones mentioned by *Vts* I and II.

Vt. IV says that, nevertheless, a prohibition of *puṃvadbhāva* must be phrased, when *luk*-deletion of a *taddhita* suffix takes place. The example is the word *pīlu*, as in *pīlu vṛkṣah* 'a *pīlu* tree' and *pīlu phalam* 'a *pīlu* fruit.' Here *pīlu* is assumed to be an adjectival word qualifying *vṛkṣa* and *phala*. In the A. the ntr. form *pīlu* is a *taddhita* *aÑ*-derivation in the sense of 'product.' The suffix is deleted by P. 4.3.163. Here the assumption of *Vt*. IV is that for a word to be called *bhāṣitapuṃska* and for *puṃvadbhāva* to be applied the criterion is a common phonetic shape, not a common *pravṛttinimitta*. This is rejected by *Vt*. V. Thereby also *Vt*. IV is dismissed.

P. 7.1.75 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of the four nominal stems *asthi* 'bone,' *dadhi* 'curds,' *sakthi* 'thigh' and *akṣi* 'eye.' The substitute is *anAṄ*, on the condition that case endings beginning with a vowel

from the instr. onwards follow immediately. *AnAṄ* is *udātta*. Examples are *asthnā* 'by means of a bone,' *dadhne* 'for curds,' *sakthnā* 'by means of the thigh' and *akṣne* 'for the eye.'

The *KV* explains that the final vowel of *asthi*, etc. is *anudātta*. Therefore, by *sthānivadbhāva*, the substitute *anAṄ* should also be *anudātta*. This is not desired. That is why P. 7.1.75 specifically says that *anAṄ* is *udātta*. The *prakriyā* of *asthnā* is provided.

The *KV* refers to what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 29. This *pbh*. says that in the *aṅgādhikāra* grammatical operations prescribed for a word are also applicable to a form ending in that word. An example is *priyāsthnā* 'by one to whom bones are dear.'

P. 7.1.76 is a *chandas* rule regarding *anaṄ*. It says that in the Vedic language *anAṄ* is seen elsewhere also. 'Elsewhere' means in other cases than for which it has been prescribed. Vedic examples are quoted according to the three conditions laid down by P. 7.1.75, and which are not met in the Vedic language.

P. 7.1.77 is a *chandas* rule dealing with substitution. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of *asthi* 'bone,' etc., mentioned in P. 7.1.75. The substitute is *udātta* long *Ī*, on the condition that a dual case ending follows immediately. Vedic examples are quoted. The *prakriyā* of the du. nom. / acc. form *akṣī* 'the two eyes' is provided.

The *KV* then raises the question of conflict. In *akṣī* the insertion of *nUM* (P. 7.1.73) has been blocked by the substitute *Ī* (P. 7.1.77), according to the *para*-principle (P. 1.4.2). A conflict between a rule introduced as a *chandas* rule and a non-*chandas* rule is possible, because the latter rule holds for *chandas* also. Having rejected the *para*-principle, we solve the conflict by means of the *utsarga-apavāda* principle.

P. 7.1.78 prohibits the augment *nUM* for the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* coming after a reduplicated verbal base. Examples are *dadat* 'one who gives,' *dadhatau* 'the two who place,' *jakṣataḥ* 'the ones who eat' and *jāgrat* 'one who is awake.' The *prakriyā* of *dadat* is provided.

We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali deals with the question how to argue the continuation of *nUM* in the present rule.

P. 7.1.79 is an optional augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is preferably not inserted in the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* coming after a reduplicated verbal base, if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. The present rule says *vā*, but *na* is assumed to be continued from P. 7.1.78, although the *KV* does not say so. Examples are *dadati / dadanti kulāni* 'families who give,' and *jakṣati / jakṣanti kulāni* 'families who eat.' The non-*nUM* forms are the preferred ones. To the *KV*, however, they are merely optional.

P. 7.1.80 is an optional augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is preferably inserted in the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* coming after a verbal base ending in *a*, short or long, if the du. nom. / acc. ending *ŚĪ* or a suffix called *nadī* follows immediately. In the present rule *vā* is continued by the *KV* from P. 7.1 79, but *na* is discontinued. The examples are *tudatī / tudantī kule* 'the two families who strike,' *yātī / yāntī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who goes,' *kariṣyatī / kariṣyantī kule* 'the two families who will do' and *kariṣyatī / kariṣyantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who will do.' The du. nom. / acc. form is identical with the sg. nom. fem. form. The *prakriyās* of *tudatī* and *kariṣyantī* are provided.

The discussion in the *KV* is based on the *bhāṣya* on the rule. Here Patañjali quotes four examples, namely, *adatī* 'the two who / which eat' / 'a female who eats,' *ghnatī* 'the two who / which kill' / 'a female who / which kills,' *lunatī* 'the two who / which mow' / 'a female who mows' and *punatī* 'the two who / which clean' / 'a female who cleans.' The forms are derived from verbal bases belonging to different conjugation classes. The question is, why doesn't P. 7.1.80 apply here? The answer is, that after the deletion of the respective *vikaraṇas*, or part of them, the verbal base no longer ends in short or long *a*. The *prakriyās* of *ghnatī* and *yāntī* are provided.

However, in *yāntī*, as well as in *tudantī* and *kariṣyantī*, a difficulty arises. It arises in that stage of the *prakriyā* in which both P. 6.1.97 (*pararūpa-ekādeśa*) and P. 6.1.101(*savarṇadīrgha-ekādeśa*) are applicable. According to the *KV*, here both rules are *antaraṅga* 'dealing with an internal *aṅga* (only).' The rules are not conditioned by an external case ending. Since they are *antaraṅga*, they prevail over the *nUM*-insertion, which is conditioned by an external (ntr. or fem.) suffix. We note that the application of the *antaraṅga-pbh.* here is wrong, because this *pbh.* does not apply within a single word-derivation. Now the difficulty after the application of the *ekādeśa* rules is that we cannot clearly show where the *aṅga* ends and where the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* starts. There is just one substitute vowel, namely, *a* or *ā*. At that point P. 6.1.85 is invoked. This rule says that the single substitute is treated like the final of the preceding unit, or like the initial of the following unit. Thus

within the same *a* or *ā* a difference is assumed which allows us to apply *nUM* by P. 7.1.80.

An objection is raised. There is a *pbh.* - not included in *PN* - which says that, when dependence is on a particular phoneme as both belonging to the preceding unit and on the following unit simultaneously, P. 6.1.85 is not to be invoked. Patañjali rejects the objection by a rather obscure statement. What he means is that *nUM* becomes part of *a* of *ŚatṚ*, if that *a* belonging to the *aṅga* is immediately followed by the *t* of *ŚatṚ*. This is the argument referred to by the *KV* as *kecit* 'some (grammarians).' It amounts to this that *nUM* is inserted in *ŚatṚ*, if (short or long) *a* belongs to an *aṅga*, and if that *aṅga* is directly followed by the *t* of *ŚatṚ*. In this view both *aṅgasya* and *Śatuḥ* are interpreted as *avayavaṣaṣṭhīs* '(genitive) case endings indicative of a part-whole relation.'

The *KV* then refers to the opinion of *apare* 'other (grammarians).' These grammarians hold that only the words *ŚĪ* and *nadī* in the rule are qualified by *āt*. Thus the rule is taken to mean that *nUM* becomes part of (the unit ending in) *ŚatṚ*, before those *ŚĪ* and *nadī* which follow directly after a stem ending in short or long *a*. Intervention by another element is not allowed. Here, however, the difficulty is that everywhere the *t* of *ŚatṚ* intervenes between the *a* of *ŚatṚ* and the following *ŚĪ* or *nadī* suffix. To remove that difficulty, the *KV* quotes a *jñāpaka* statement from the *Mbh.* It says that rules are to be applied on the strength of their being stated, in spite of an intervening element, if that intervention cannot be avoided. Since the intervention of *t* of *ŚatṚ* takes place necessarily, we can still apply P. 7.1.80 in the forms concerned.

An appraisal of the *apara* part of the *KV's* comment is added. By adopting the *padasaṃskāra*-view the flaw in the argument is exposed. In this view we have to place the word-elements side by side from which we derive the form desired. In our case, that gives us, for instance, ((*tud* + *a* + *ŚatṚ*) + (*ŚĪ* / *ṄĪP*) + *sU*)). Here we can clearly show the relation between the *aṅga* ending in *a* and *ŚatṚ*, on the one hand, and between *ŚatṚ* and the following suffixes on the other hand. It is concluded that in the view ascribed to *kecit* the *antaraṅga-pbh* is wrongly applied, and that in the view ascribed to *apare* a wrong word-analysis is assumed. Therefore here the contribution made by the *KV* consists in the correct explanation of the rule and in the examples quoted. The rest is a bungled affair.

P. 7.1.81 is an augment rule containing the word *nityam*. The augment is *nUM*. It is invariably inserted in the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* coming after a verbal base ending in *ŚaP* or *ŚyaN*, if the du. nom. / acc. case ending *ŚĪ* or a suffix called

nadī follow immediately. *Nityam* cancels *vā* from P. 7.1.79, continued in P. 7.1.80. Examples are (for *ŚaP*) *pacantī kule* 'the two families who cook' and *pacantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who cooks,' and (for *ŚyaN*) *dīvyantī kule* 'the two families who gamble' and *sīvyantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who sews.'

P. 7.1.82 is an augment rule. The augment is *nUM*. It is inserted in *anaḍuh* 'a draught-animal, bullock,' if the sg. nom. ending *sU* follows immediately. The examples are *anaḍvān* 'a bullock' and *he anaḍvan* 'o bullock.' The *prakriyā* of *anaḍvān* is provided.

The *KV* refers to two opinions, ascribed to *kecit* 'some (grammarians)' and *apare* 'other (grammarians).' The first view holds that *nUM* is added after *āM* and *aM* have been inserted in *anaḍuh* by P. 7.1.98 and 99. The second view holds that joint application (*samāveśa*) of the augments *āM* / *am* and *nUM* is desired. Between the two no *bādhyabādhaka* relation exists. A comparable case is *cicīṣati* 'he desires to pile up.' Here lengthening and reduplication are jointly applied. One does not set aside the other. The corresponding *prakriyā* is provided.

We have three *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I points out that in the stage *anaḍuh* + *sU* there is an undesired chance for the augment *āM* to be blocked by *nUM*, because the *nUM*-rule (P. 7.1.82) is *anavakāśa* 'having no scope for application (elsewhere).' *Vt* II rejects *Vt*. I. *Vt*. III, part 1, proposes an alternative. We can manage by *punaḥprasaṅga* 're-applicability (of the superseded rule).' That is to say, after applying P. 7.1.82, we can still apply the *āM*-rule P. 7.1.98. *Vt*. III, part 2, mentions analogous instances of joint application. One example is *jagle* 'he has become tired.' Here the jointly applying rules are P. 6.1.16 for the substitution of *ā* for the verbal base vowel *ai*, and the reduplication rule P. 6.1.108. In this case the substitution rule is applied at an earlier stage, because it concerns the *upadeśa* form of the verbal base. The *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.83 is a *chandas* rule regarding *nUM*. It says that *nUM* is inserted in *dṛś* 'looking (like),' *svavas* 'affording good protection,' and *svatavas* 'self-strong,' if the sg. nom. ending *sU* follows immediately. Examples are the sg. nom. masc. forms *īdṛṅ* 'a such-like one,' *tādṛṅ* 'a such-like one,' *sadṛṅ* 'one similar to,' *svavān* 'one affording good protection' and *svatavān* 'a self-strong one.' The *prakriyā* of *īdṛṅ* is provided.

P. 7.1.84 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of *div* 'sky,' if the sg. nom. case ending *su* follows immediately. The substitute is *auT*. The example is *dyauḥ* 'the sky.' The *prakriyā* is provided.

The *KV* notes that *div* mentioned in the rule is not the verbal base *div-* which carries an *anubandha*. Therefore the present rule does not apply in the *upapada* cp. *aksadyūḥ* 'one who plays dice.' The corresponding *prakriyā* is provided.

We have three *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that the *auT*-substitution is prohibited in the case of the verbal base *div-*. *Vt.* II says that the continuation of the word *adhātoḥ* from P. 7.1.70 in the present rule would lead to a difficulty in the ntr. pl. forms. An example is *kāṣṭhataṅkṣi* '(those carpenter families) who fashion wood.' Here we will not be able to insert *nUM* because of the restriction *adhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.70. The *prakriyā* is provided. *Vt.* III says that we already have a statement in this matter. The statement says that the mention of a form without *anubandha* does not include the same form with *anubandha*.

Regarding the continuation of the word *adhātoḥ*, Patañjali has an alternative idea. He thinks that a *saṃbandha* 'connection' is to be continued. What he means by *saṃbandha* is a connected statement. By its continuation the continuation of a topic can be shown. In P. 7.1.70 *adhātoḥ* is connected with the words *ugit*, *sarvanāmasthāne* and *num*. These four words are continued in the rules between P. 7.1.70 and P. 7.1.84. They may not be applicable in all of these rules, but they are kept in a state of suspended animation, so to speak. When need arises, they can be made use of. That is how we can supply the word *adhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.84.

P. 7.1.85 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of *pathin* 'path,' *mathin* 'churning stick' and *ṛbhukṣin* 'name of Indra,' if *sU* follows immediately. The substitute is *āT*. The examples are *panthāḥ* 'a path,' *manthāḥ* 'a churning stick' and *ṛbhukṣāḥ* 'Indra.' The *prakriyā* of *panthāḥ* is provided.

P. 7.1.86 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the phoneme *iT* of the stems mentioned by P. 7.1.85. The substitute is short *a* (*aT*), provided that a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. Examples are *panthāḥ* 'a path' (sg. nom.), *manthānau* 'the two churning sticks' (du. nom. acc.), *ṛbhukṣaṇāḥ* 'the Indras' (pl. nom.) and *panthānam* 'a path' (sg. acc.).

We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that the statement of *at* in P. 7.1.86 is not required, because the context deals with the *āT*-substitution. In the *prakriyā* it makes no difference whether *āT* is prescribed, or *aT*. *Vt.* II points out that, however, *at* in P. 7.1.86 is purposeful. Its function is to allow the alternative sg. acc. form *ṛbhukṣaṇam* by P. 6.4.9.

P. 7.1.87 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the *th* of the stems mentioned by P. 7.1.85. The substitute is *nth*. Examples are *panthāḥ* 'a path' (sg. nom.), *panthānau* 'the two paths' (du. nom. / acc.) and *manthānaḥ* 'the churning sticks' (pl. nom.).

P. 7.1.88 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the *ṭi*-portion of the *bha* stem of the stems mentioned by P. 7.1.86. *Bha* is the designation given to a nominal stem before a case ending which begins with a vowel or *y*, excluding *sarvanāmasthāna* endings. The substitute is *lopa*. Examples are *pathaḥ* 'paths' (pl. acc.). *mathā* 'by means of a churning stick' (sg. instr.) and *ṛbhukṣe* 'for Indra' (sg. dat.). No examples are quoted for the du. gen. / loc. ending *-os*.

P. 7.1.89 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of *puṃs* 'man,' provided that a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. The substitute is *asUṄ*. The examples are *pumān* (sg. nom.), *pumāṃsau* 'the two men' (du. nom. / acc.) and *pumāṃsaḥ* (pl. nom.). The *prakriyā* of *pumān* is provided. We note that *pumān* is *ādyudātta*.

Following *Vt*. I on the rule, the *KV* says that in *paramapumān* 'the highest man,' i.e., Vishnu, there is a chance for an undesired accent (on the syllable *pu*) once the case ending has been added. To prevent that, a statement of *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like a form quoted in the *upadeśa*' for *asUṄ* is required. That is to say, the original form of *puṃs* is assumed to be *pumas*, in which the *asUṄ*-substitution has already taken place.

We have one *Vt*. on the rule. It says that regarding P. 7.12.89 a statement of *upadeśivat* '(treatment) like a form quoted in the *upadeśa*' should be made to justify the accent, because (*asUṄ*) is *bahiraṅga* 'conditioned by an external cause.' *Upadeśa* is the original mention of a linguistic form in Pāṇini's own usage. The external conditioning element is the case ending *sU*. According to Patañjali, the example which the *Vt*. has in view is *paramapumān*. By the general accent rule P. 6.1.223 the accent of this form should be *antodātta*. But there is an undesired chance for the accent to be on the syllable *pu*. To show how that is possible a *prakriyā* of *paramapumān* is provided. The way to prevent this undesired accent is *upadeśivadbhāva*. Thereby, as stated above, the original form of *puṃs* is assumed to be *pumas*. On this assumption we can apply the desired accent by P. 6.1.223. But, as pointed out by us, we can manage by the *satiśiṣṭa* accent prescribed by *Vt*. IX on P. 6.1.158. Thus *Vt*. I on P. 7.1.89 is not required.

P. 7.1.90 is an *atideśasūtra* 'rule of treatment (of y) like (x).' It deals with *ṇittva* 'being marked with the *anubandha* Ṇ.' The items to be treated as *Ṇit* are the *sarvanāmasthāna* endings coming after the stem *go* 'cow; bull.' The *anubandha* Ṇ causes *vṛddhi* of the *aṅga* final vowel by P. 7.2.115 and of the penultimate vowel by P. 7.2.116. The examples quoted for the rule are *gauḥ* (sg. nom.), *gāvau* (du. nom./acc.) and *gāvah* (pl. nom.). Here *vṛddhi* is applied by P. 7.2.115.

The form *gotah* in the rule presents a difficulty. According to tradition, here the *t* is the *anubandha T* (P. 1.1.70) added in order to restrict the application of the rule to the stem *go* only, to the exclusion of forms like *citraguḥ* 'one having brindled cows.'

To explain that the element for which *Ṇittva* is prescribed is a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending, tradition offers four interpretation of the rule, three of which can be dismissed. The interpretation accepted is the one which says that after *go* a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending is *niḍvat* 'treated like having Ṇ as an *it*-letter.' This is the *atideśa*-interpretation.

To justify the sg. voc. form *he citrago* 'o owner of brindled cows,' the *KV* invokes what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 90. The maxim says that after an *aṅga*-operation a second *aṅga*-operation is not allowed. This means that after the application of *guṇa* by P. 7.3.108, the *Ṇit* operation by P. 7.2.115 is not allowed. The argument is not convincing, because *aṅga*-operations are many times applied in succession to the same stem. The better reference should be to *PN*, *pbh*. 105.

The *KV* refers to the opinion of some grammarians (*kecit*), which has not been recorded in the *bhāṣya* on the present rule. These grammarians read the rule as *oto ṇit*, so that the rule becomes applicable to the stem *dyo* 'sky' also. Examples are *dyauḥ* (sg. nom.), *dyāvau* 'heaven and earth' and *dyāvaḥ* (pl. nom.). This reading of the rule is rejected by saying that the word *gotaḥ* is a mere general indication (*upalakṣaṇa*) of a form ending in *o*, because the *anubandha T* is added after a vowel only. In fact, the reading *oto ṇit* makes the better sense. It justifies the *taparakaraṇa* of P. 1.1.70, and it includes all stems ending in *o*. Could this also be the original reading? If so, then how to explain the reading *goto ṇit*? A suggestion is offered.

We have four *Vts* on the rule. Introducing *Vt*. I Patañjali raises the question, how to interpret the rule. *Vt*. I says that an extension of the *Ṇit*-operation should take place, if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately after *go*. This amounts to the *atideśa*-interpretation mentioned above. *Vt*. II states the reason for *Vt*. I. Patañjali explains that, given the absence of a genitive word (*sarvanāmasthānasya*)

identifying the item to which *Ṇittva* is to be applied, we may interpret *gotaḥ* as a genitive and *ṇit* as *ṇidvat* in the sense of *ṇitkāryam* 'operation (on the stem *go*) due to an element marked with *Ṇ*,' that is, *vṛddhi*. After all, *vrddhi* is applied to *go*. *Vt*. III says that the mention of the *anubandha* is redundant, taking into account the prohibition of *sthānivadbhāva* in the case of *go*, specifically mentioned by *Vt*. XXIX on P. 1.1.56. *Vt*. IV states the reason for *Vt*. III. Otherwise, that is, even if the *T* is mentioned, a prohibition of of *Ṇittva* in connection with *go* must be phrased for the sg. voc. and the pl. nom. of *citragu* and *śabalagu*. To explain the point involved, the *prakriyā* of (*he*) *citrago*) is provided.

P. 7.1.91 is an optional *atideśasūtra* dealing with *Ṇittva*, like P. 7.1.90. The item to be treated as *Ṇit* is the pf. first person *ṆaL*. The option is expresed by *vā* 'preferably.' Thereby the pf. first person is preferably *Ṇit*, so that the preferred forms show *vṛddhi* by P. 7.2.115 and 116. The examples are *ahaṃ cakāra / cakara* 'I have done' and *ahaṃ papāca / papaca* 'I have cooked.'

P. 7.2.92 is an *atideśasūtra* dealing with *Ṇittva*, like P. 7.1.90 and 91. The items to be treated as *Ṇit* are the *sarvanāmasthāna* endings, except the sg. voc., coming after the stem *sakhi* 'friend.' The examples are *sakhāyau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *sakhāyaḥ* (pl. nom.).

P. 7.2.93 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of *sakhi* 'friend' if the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending *sU* follows immediately. The substitute is *anAṄ*. The example is the sg. nom. *sakhā*. The *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.94 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final of stems ending in short *r*, and of three specifically mentioned stems, *uśanas* 'name of a Vedic sage,' *purudaṃsas* 'abounding in mighty deeds,' and *anehas* 'without a rival.' The condition is that the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending *sU* must follow immediately. Examples are sg. nom. forms, (for stems ending in short *r*) *kartā* 'one who does,' *mātā* 'mother,' *pitā* 'father,' (and for the other stems) *uśanā*, *purudaṃśā* and *anehā*.

The *KV* quotes a *Ślokavārttika* which tells us that for the sg. voc. of *uśanas* three forms are available, (*he*) *uśanaḥ*, *uśanan* and *uśana*.

P. 7.1.95 is an *atideśūtra* dealing with *tṛjvadbhāva* 'treatment like a form ending in *tṛC*.' The item to be treated like that is the stem *kroṣṭu* 'jackal,' if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. The examples are *kroṣṭā* (sg. nom.), *kroṣṭārau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *kroṣṭāraḥ* (pl. nom.).

We have a *Ślokavārttika* and 14 *Vts* on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96. See under P. 7.1.96.

P. 7.1.96 is an *atideśūtra* dealing with *tṛjvadbhāva* 'treatment like a form ending in *tṛC*.' The item to be treated like that is *kroṣṭu* 'jackal,' when used in the fem. gender. Thus in the fem. gender *kroṣṭu* becomes *kroṣṭṛ* before all case endings. The examples are *kroṣṭrī* (sg. nom.), *kroṣṭrībhyām* (du. instr.) and *kroṣṭrībhiḥ* (pl. instr.). The *prakriyā* of *kroṣṭrī* is provided. The form derived is *antodātta*.

The *KV* notes a difficulty in connection with the expression *pañcakroṣṭṛbhī rathaiḥ* 'with chariots bought for five female jackals,' an example borrowed from Patañjali. *Pañcakroṣṭṛbhiḥ* is a *taddhita* derivation by P. 5.1.19, where *luK* is applied both to the *taddhita* suffix and to the fem. suffix. The difficulty now is that, if the fem. suffix is *luk*-deleted, there can be no *tṛjvadbhāva*, because - so it is assumed - *tṛjvadbhāva* is dependent on the fem. suffix. The view is wrong on two accounts. It assumes that *striyām* in the rule refers to a to a fem. suffix, and, secondly, that *tṛjvadbhāva* is conditoned by a fem. suffix.

The first line of the *Ślokavt*. says that, if the word *vibhaktau* 'if a case ending follows immediately' is continued in the rule as a condition, then we cannot justify the *bv*. cp. *kroṣṭrībhakti* 'one whose object of worship is a female jackal.' In the *prakriyā* the internal case endings of the cp. constituents are *luk*-deleted. No case ending, no *tṛjvadbhāva*. Patañjali tries to find a way out by a highly artificial analysis of the word *striyām* in P. 7.1.96. The argument is wrong, because *tṛjvadbhāva* of *kroṣṭu* is not dependent on a case ending. We note two differences with regard to the argument stated by the *KV*. In the first place, the example provided by the *KV* is different. In the second place, whereas, according to the *KV*, *tṛjvadbhāva* is dependent on a fem. suffix, according to the *Ślokavt*., it is dependent on a case ending in the fem. gender.

The *Vts* on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96 fall into three groups. *Vts* I-VI deal with the question of *śāstrātideśa* versus *rūpātideśa*, *Vts* VII-IX discuss the question whether P. 7.1.95-96 are redundant, and *Vts* X-XIV deal with the augments *nUM* and *nUṬ*.

Śāstrātideśa in our case means that a rule or operation applicable to *tṛjanta* forms is extended to *kroṣṭu*. The operations in question are lengthening (P. 6.4.11), *guṇa* (P. 7.3.110) and *anAṄ* (P. 7.1.94). *Rūpātideśa* means that a particular word form is transferred to a word which does not have that form. In our case, a *tṛjanta* form is transferred to *kroṣṭu*, which does not have that form. Thus, *kroṣṭu* becomes *kroṣṭṛ*

identifying the item to which *Ṇittva* is to be applied, we may interpret *gotaḥ* as a genitive and *ṇit* as *ṇidvat* in the sense of *ṇitkāryam* 'operation (on the stem *go*) due to an element marked with Ṇ,' that is, *vṛddhi*. After all, *vrddhi* is applied to *go*. *Vt.* III says that the mention of the *anubandha* is redundant, taking into account the prohibition of *sthānivadbhāva* in the case of *go*, specifically mentioned by *Vt.* XXIX on P. 1.1.56. *Vt.* IV states the reason for *Vt.* III. Otherwise, that is, even if the *T* is mentioned, a prohibition of of *Ṇittva* in connection with *go* must be phrased for the sg. voc. and the pl. nom. of *citragu* and *śabalagu*. To explain the point involved, the *prakriyā* of (*he*) *citrago*) is provided.

P. 7.1.91 is an optional *atideśasūtra* dealing with *Ṇittva*, like P. 7.1.90. The item to be treated as *Ṇit* is the pf. first person *ṆaL*. The option is expresed by *vā* 'preferably.' Thereby the pf. first person is preferably *Ṇit*, so that the preferred forms show *vṛddhi* by P. 7.2.115 and 116. The examples are *ahaṃ cakāra / cakara* 'I have done' and *ahaṃ papāca / papaca* 'I have cooked.'

P. 7.2.92 is an *atideśasūtra* dealing with *Ṇittva*, like P. 7.1.90 and 91. The items to be treated as *Ṇit* are the *sarvanāmasthāna* endings, except the sg. voc., coming after the stem *sakhi* 'friend.' The examples are *sakhāyau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *sakhāyaḥ* (pl. nom.).

P. 7.2.93 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final phoneme of *sakhi* 'friend' if the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending *sU* follows immediately. The substitute is *anAṄ*. The example is the sg. nom. *sakhā*. The *prakriyā* is provided.

P. 7.1.94 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the final of stems ending in short *r*, and of three specifically mentioned stems, *uśanas* 'name of a Vedic sage,' *purudaṃsas* 'abounding in mighty deeds,' and *anehas* 'without a rival.' The condition is that the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending *sU* must follow immediately. Examples are sg. nom. forms, (for stems ending in short *r*) *kartā* 'one who does,' *mātā* 'mother,' *pitā* 'father,' (and for the other stems) *uśanā*, *purudaṃśā* and *anehā*.

The *KV* quotes a *Ślokavārttika* which tells us that for the sg. voc. of *uśanas* three forms are available, (*he*) *uśanaḥ*, *uśanan* and *uśana*.

P. 7.1.95 is an *atideśūtra* dealing with *tṛjvadbhāva* 'treatment like a form ending in *tṛC*.' The item to be treated like that is the stem *kroṣṭu* 'jackal,' if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. The examples are *kroṣṭā* (sg. nom.), *kroṣṭārau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *kroṣṭāraḥ* (pl. nom.).

We have a *Ślokavārttika* and 14 *Vts* on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96. See under P. 7.1.96.

P. 7.1.96 is an *atideśūtra* dealing with *tṛjvadbhāva* 'treatment like a form ending in *tṛC*.' The item to be treated like that is *kroṣṭu* 'jackal,' when used in the fem. gender. Thus in the fem. gender *kroṣṭu* becomes *kroṣṭṛ* before all case endings. The examples are *kroṣṭrī* (sg. nom.), *kroṣṭrībhyām* (du. instr.) and *kroṣṭrībhiḥ* (pl. instr.). The *prakriyā* of *kroṣṭrī* is provided. The form derived is *antodātta*.

The *KV* notes a difficulty in connection with the expression *pañcakroṣṭṛbhī rathaiḥ* 'with chariots bought for five female jackals,' an example borrowed from Patañjali. *Pañcakroṣṭṛbhiḥ* is a *taddhita* derivation by P. 5.1.19, where *luK* is applied both to the *taddhita* suffix and to the fem. suffix. The difficulty now is that, if the fem. suffix is *luk*-deleted, there can be no *tṛjvadbhāva*, because - so it is assumed - *tṛjvadbhāva* is dependent on the fem. suffix. The view is wrong on two accounts. It assumes that *striyām* in the rule refers to a to a fem. suffix, and, secondly, that *tṛjvadbhāva* is conditoned by a fem. suffix.

The first line of the *Ślokavt*. says that, if the word *vibhaktau* 'if a case ending follows immediately' is continued in the rule as a condition, then we cannot justify the *bv*. cp. *kroṣṭrībhakti* 'one whose object of worship is a female jackal.' In the *prakriyā* the internal case endings of the cp. constituents are *luk*-deleted. No case ending, no *tṛjvadbhāva*. Patañjali tries to find a way out by a highly artificial analysis of the word *striyām* in P. 7.1.96. The argument is wrong, because *tṛjvadbhāva* of *kroṣṭu* is not dependent on a case ending. We note two differences with regard to the argument stated by the *KV*. In the first place, the example provided by the *KV* is different. In the second place, whereas, according to the *KV*, *tṛjvadbhāva* is dependent on a fem. suffix, according to the *Ślokavt*., it is dependent on a case ending in the fem. gender.

The *Vts* on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96 fall into three groups. *Vts* I-VI deal with the question of *śāstrātideśa* versus *rūpātideśa*, *Vts* VII-IX discuss the question whether P. 7.1.95-96 are redundant, and *Vts* X-XIV deal with the augments *nUM* and *nUṬ*.

Śāstrātideśa in our case means that a rule or operation applicable to *tṛjanta* forms is extended to *kroṣṭu*. The operations in question are lengthening (P. 6.4.11), *guṇa* (P. 7.3.110) and *anAṄ* (P. 7.1.94). *Rūpātideśa* means that a particular word form is transferred to a word which does not have that form. In our case, a *tṛjanta* form is transferred to *kroṣṭu*, which does not have that form. Thus, *kroṣṭu* becomes *kroṣṭṛ*

for all practical purposes. Once *kroṣṭu* has been practically replaced by *kroṣṭṛ*, we can manage by *sthānyādeśabhāva*.

Vt. VII means to say that there is no point in replacing *kroṣṭu* by *kroṣṭṛ*. We can simply derive *kroṣṭu* and *kroṣṭṛ* as independent words, namely, as an *uṇādi tuN*-derivarion and as a *tṛC*-derivation respectively. The corresponding *prakriyās* are provided. *Vt.* VIII denies the redundancy of the two rules. *Kroṣṭu* and *kroṣṭṛ* are general forms, not providing details of declension. In language sometimes use is made of *kroṣṭu*, sometimes of *kroṣṭṛ*. The purpose of P. 7.1.95-96 is to delimit these uses. *Vt.* IX deals with P. 7.1.97. The *Vt.* says that here the statement of *vā*, taken as expressing a general option - P. 7.1.97 actually says *vibhāṣā* - is naturally established. The option concerns the use of *kroṣṭu* or *kroṣṭṛ* before the instr. case endings beginning with a vowel. The idea is that it is up to the speaker to use either *kroṣṭu* or *kroṣṭṛ* in the cases mentioned, when referring to a jackal.

Vt. X says that the insertion of the augment *nUM* P. 7.1.73) prevails over three specified operations, by *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict procedure in which the earlier rule prevails. The reason stated is wrong. The *nUM*-rule prevails because it is a word-building rule. Therefore *Vt.* X is not required. *Vt.* XI says that *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.54) prevails over *nUM*, the *ra*-substitution (P. 7.2.100) and *tṛjvadbhā*va (P. 7.1.95-96), by *pūrvavipratiṣedha*. Here also the reason stated is wrong. *NUṬ* prevails over *nUM*, because the rule concerned is an *apavāda* to the *nUM*-rule, and because, in relation to the other two operations, the *nUṬ*-rule is a word-building rule. *Vt.* XII phrases a special statement regarding the *ra*-substitution amounting to a prohibition of this substitution, when the question is of applying *nUṬ*. *Vt.* XIII states the reason for the prohibition. *Vt.* XIV draws the conclusion. Wherever *nUṬ* is applied, the *ra*-substitution is prohibited.

P. 7.1.97 is an optional *atideśasūtra* dealing with *tṛjvadbhāva*' treatment like a form ending in *tṛC*.' The item concerned is *kroṣṭu* 'jackal.' It is better not (*vibhāsā*) treated as ending in *tṛC*, if a case ending beginning with a vowel follows immediately, starting from the instr. endings. The examples are *kroṣṭunā* / *kroṣṭrā* (sg. instr.), *kroṣṭune* / *kroṣṭre* (sg. dat.), *kroṣṭoḥ* / *kroṣṭuḥ* (sg. abl. gen.), *kroṣṭau* / *kroṣṭari* (sg. loc.) and *kroṣṭvoḥ* / *kroṣṭroḥ* (du. gen. loc.). The forms stated first are the preferred ones.

The *KV* quotes *Vts* X and XI on P. 7.1.95-96 as a combined statement.

P. 7.1.98 is an augment rule. The augment is *āM*, which is *udātta* 'having hight pitch.' It is inserted in the stems *catur* 'four' and *anaḍuh* 'a draught-animal,'

if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately. The examples are *catvāraḥ* (nom. masc.), *anaḍvān* (sg. nom.), *anaḍvāhau* (du. nom. / acc.), *anaḍvāhaḥ* (pl. nom.) and *anaḍvāham* (sg. acc.).

The *KV* notes that the present rule also applied to *bv.* cps. ending in *catur* and *anaḍuḥ*. Examples are *priyacatvāraḥ* 'ones to whom four are dear' and *priyānaḍvāhaḥ* 'ones to whom draught-animals are dear.'

We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It says that in the fem. the augment *āM* is optional in connection with *anaḍuh*. The example is *anaḍuhī / anaḍvāhī*.

P. 7.1.99 is an augment rule, which states an exception to P. 7.1.98. The augment is *aM*. It is inserted in the stems *catur* 'four' and *anaḍuḥ* 'a draught-animal,' if the sg. voc. ending follows immediately. The *KV* quotes examples for *bv.* cps ending in the two stems mentioned. They are *he priyacatvaḥ* 'o one to whom four are dear' and *priyānaḍvan* 'o one to whom draught-animals are dear.'

P. 7.1.100 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is long *ṝ* in final position of a verbal base. The substitute is *iT*. The examples are *kirati* 'he scatters,' *girati* 'he swallows,' *āstīrṇam* 'covered' (sg. nom. / acc. ntr.) and *viśīrṇam* 'shattered' (sg. nom. / acc. ntr.). The *prakriyās* of *kirati* and *āstīrṇam* are provided.

We have no *Vts*, but there is a *bhāṣya* on the combined rules P. 7.1.100-02.

P. 7.1.101 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is the prefinal long *ṝ* of a verbal base. The substitute is *iT*. The examples are *kīrttayati* 'he praises,' *kīrttayataḥ* 'the two of them praise' and *kīrttayanti* 'they praise.'

P. 7.1.102 is a substitution rule. The item to be replaced is long *ṝ* in final position of a verbal base, if preceded by a labial. The substitute is *uT*. The examples are *pūrtāḥ piṇḍāḥ* 'fully prepared, rounded rice balls offered to the ancestors,' *mumūrṣati* 'he wishes to die' and *susvūrṣati* 'he wishes to make a sound.' The *prakriyās* of *pūrta* and *mumūrṣati* are provided.

The *KV* points out that the rule also applies in connection with the labio-dental sound *v*. The examples are *vuvūrṣati ṛtvijam* 'he wishes to choose an *ṛtvij*' and *prāvuvūrṣati kambalam* 'he wishes to put on a woollen wrapper.'

The *KV* then quotes a *Bhāṣyavārttika*. It says that *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* prevail over the substitution of *i* and *u* by conflict procedure. Reference is to the procedure laid down by P. 1.4.2. In fact, *guṇa* (P. 7.3.84 and 86) prevails because of *apavādatva*, and *vṛddhi* (P. 7.1.102) prevails by *sāmarthya*, that is, on the strength of its being stated. For a distinction between operations caused by an *upadeśa* element like *anubandhas* and operations caused by a non-*upadeśa* element, in which the first operations prevail, see *AP* IX, p. 231. Examples are *āstaraṇam* 'a covering,' *āstārakaḥ* 'one who covers,' *niparaṇam* 'the act of putting down rice for deceased relatives' and *nipārakaḥ* 'one who puts down rice for deceased relatives.'

P. 7.1.103 is a *chandas* rule dealing with the substitution of *uT* for final long *r* of a verbal base. It says that this substitution is variously applied. Accordingly, the substitution is applied when long *ṝ* is not preceded by a labial, and it may not be applied even when the *ṝ* is preceded by a labial. Vedic examples are quoted.

AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ

7. Adhyāya 7

7.1 Pāda 1

7.1.1 YUVOR ANĀKAU '*ana* and *aka* (come) in place of *yu* and *vu* (respectively, coming after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of linguistic elements for two (artificial) *upadeśa* elements.

2. The section dealing with *bha* stems has ended with P. 6.4.175. A new *pāda* starts in which the *aṅgādhikāra* is continued.

The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *yuvoḥ*. Here *aṅgāt* 'after a presuffixal stem' is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Aṅgāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. It follows that *yu* and *vu* must be *pratyayas*. *Yuvoḥ* is a technical (dual) gen. by P. 1.1.49 of the *itaretarayogadvandva yuvū*. By Pāṇinian standards it is an irregular form, as pointed out by tradition. The *vidheya* is *anākau*. Since P. 7.1.1 contains an equal number of *sthānins* and *ādeśas*, P. 1.3.10 is applied.

3. The *KV* explains that *yu* and *vu* have been stripped of distinctive elements, that is, of *anubandhas*. Therefore *yu* and *vu* stand for any suffix containing *yu* or *vu*. That *yu* and *vu* are replaced by *ana* and *aka* respectively. Full forms are :

(a) For *yu*, *Lyu* (P. 3.1.134), *LyuṬ* (P. 3.3.113), *Ṭyu* and *ṬyuL* (P. 4.3.23).

(b) For *vu*, *ṆvuL* (P. 3.1.113), *vuÑ* (P. 3.2.146; 4.2.39), *vuN* (P. 3.1.149; 4.2.161).

In addition, the *KV* states that *yu* and *vu* are nasalized, but leaves the question whether the nasalized element is the semivowel or the vowel undecided. But Kātyāyana in *Vt*. XXII, as explained and followed by Patañjali, concludes that the nasalized elements are the semivowels. The *Nyāsa* literally quotes Patañjali (*Mbh*. (III, p. 240, lines 15-16) saying that semivowels may be nasalized or not. For nasalized semivowels compare *Vt*. I on P. 8.2.23 and Whitney, § 71, c. In the present rule reference is to the nasalized variety on the basis of tradition. As stated by the *KV* on P. 1.3.2, *pratijñānunāsikyāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ* 'the followers of Pāṇini accept nasality

by convention.' The grammatical point of assuming nasalized semivowels will become clear later on.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are:

(a) For *Lyu*, *nandanaḥ* 'one who gladdens' (sg. nom. masc.), and *ramaṇaḥ* 'one who pleases' (sg. nom. masc.). Reference is to P. 3.1.134.

(b) For *Ṭyu* and *ṬyuL*, *sāyaṃtanaḥ* 'relating to evening time' (sg. nom. masc.) and *ciraṃtanaḥ* 'relating to ancient time' (sg. nom. masc.) Reference is to P. 4.3.23.

(c) For *ṆvuL*, *kārakaḥ* 'one who acts' and *hārakaḥ* 'one who seizes.' Reference is to P. 3.1.133.

(d) For *vuN*, *vāsudevakaḥ* 'one who worships Vāsudeva' (sg. nom. masc.) and *arjunakaḥ* 'one who worships Arjuna' (sg. nom. masc.). Reference is to P. 4.3.98. Here Patañjali notes that Vāsudeva is not a mere *kṣatriya* name, but that of *tatrabhavat*, i.e., Krishna. Compare Agrawala [2]1963, p. 360-361 for the *bhakti* cult.

5. To point out the significance of nasalization, the *KV* quotes the counter-examples *ūrṇāyuḥ* 'one who possesses woollen threads,' *bhujyuḥ* 'recipient' and *mṛtyuḥ* 'death.' *Ūrṇāyuḥ* is a *taddhita yuS*-derivation by P. 5.2.123, *bhujyuḥ* and *mṛtyuḥ* are formed by *uṇādisūtra* 308. Patañjali mentions two more examples, namely, *kaṃyuḥ* 'happy,' and *śaṃyuḥ* 'benevolent' (*Mbh.* III, p. 236, line 20). They are also *taddhita yuS-* derivations by P. 5.2.138. So, in all, we have five words in which *yu* is not nasalized.

6. The *KV* points out that, given the alternative of *dvandvaikavadbhāva* 'treatment of a *dvandva* cp. as a singular form' (P. 2.4.6; compare also *PN*, *pbh.* 30), we would expect the sg. gen. of the neuter *samāhāradvandva yuvu* to read *yuvu-n-aḥ* by P. 7.1.73. But, since the text of the rule reads *yuvoḥ*, without *nUM* being added, we conclude that a rule teaching an augment is not universally valid: *anityam āgamaśāsanam*. Alternatively, in spite of P. 2.4.17, we need not accept that *yuvu* is a neuter word. We may refer to the maxim *liṅgam aśiṣyam lokāśrayatvāl liṅgasya* 'gender need not be taught because it depends on usage' (*Mbh.* I, p. 390, lines 18-19). Therefore *yuvu* could be a masc. form also. In that case, the sg. gen. *yuvoh* is correct. But, if we accept the alternative that the form under discussion is an *itaretara(yoga)dvandva*, to be read as *yuvū*, then the (du.) gen. would read *yuvvoḥ*. In that case, we may consider the deletion of the sound *ū* (→ *v*) in the

text-reading *yuvoḥ* to be a peculiarity of the Vedic language. *Chandovat sūtrāṇi bhavanti* '*sūtras* are (not *chandas*, but they are treated) like *chandas*.'

7. Finally, the *KV* quotes two *kārikās* from an unknown source. They sum up the discussion as follows : (Objection) If *yuvoḥ* is taken as the mention of a dual, it follows that there would be doubling for the semivowel (*v*, as in *yuvvoḥ*). But if (we assume) treatment as a single (and, therefore, a ntr.) form , how can this (form *yuvu*) be treated as a masculine? (Answer) If a dual, there is deletion peculiar to the Vedic language. If a singular, there is non-universal validity of *nUM*. Or masculine gender is accepted here because gender need not be taught.

8. We have 22 *Vts* on the rule. *Vts* I-III deal with the question whether a prohibition should be phrased for *yu* and *vu* when occurring as part of a verbal base and as part of particular *prātipadikas*. The answer is no, because in these cases the *u* of *yu* and *vu* has not been nasalized. Consequently, it cannot be an *it*-letter, by P. 1.3.2.

Vt. IV-IX deal with the *ugittva* 'being marked with *U* as an *it*-letter' of the suffixes *yu* and *vu*. Reference is to P. 4.1.6 and P. 7.1.70. Here the first rule informs us that the fem. suffix *ṄīP* is added after stems marked as *ugit* 'having *U* as an *it*-letter.' The second rule prescribes the augment *nUM* before the *sarvanāmasthāna* case endings of stems which are *ugit*. Since *yu* and *vu* are *ugit*, this gives rise to a number of problems to solve which the *Vts* IV-XXI are phrased. *Vt*. IV states a prohibition of *ṄīP* and *nUM* in spite of *ugittva*. Examples are *nandanā* and *kārikā*. *Vt*. V extends the prohibition to verbal bases. An example is *divU*- (*Dhp*. 4.1). *Vt*. VI notes that the addition of the *anubandha Ṣ* provides the clue that a grammatical operation dependent on the *it*-letter *U* does not take place. *Vt*. VII denies that, and says that the *Ṣ* has been added for a different purpose. *Vts* VIII and IX deal with the function of the *anubandha Ṭ*. *Vt*. X points out that the final of a verbal base, like the *U* of *divU*- is a meaningless element. Therefore P. 7.1.1 is not applicable. This rule applies to meaningful units only of which the *u* forms part. *VU* in *divU*- is not a meaningful unit.

Vt. XI says that in the *nUM*-rule (P. 7.1.70) inclusion of *jhaL*, that is, *jhalanta* 'ending in a *jhaL* sound (any speechsound except nasals and semivowels),' should be made. Thereby *ugit* stems before *sarvanāmasthāna* endings which happen to be end in a *jhaL* sound will take the augment *nUM*. *Vt*. XII says that this is necessary in order to prohibit the addition of *nUM* for stems to which a (fem.) gender suffix has been added. Reference is to what later has become *PN*, *pbh*. 71. This *pbh*. says that the term *prātipadika* also stands for a stem to which a gender suffix has been

added. *Vt.* XIII rejects this by saying that, wherever a grammatical operation is conditioned by a *vibhakti* (like *sarvanāmasthāna* endings), it is not allowed in the case of stems ending in a fem. suffix. Reference is to what later has become *PN*, *pbh*. 72. This *pbh*. says that the term *prātipadika* in a rule conditioned by a case ending does not include the form derived by the addition of a gender suffix. Patañjali quotes examples for this *pbh*. in his commentary on *Vts* XIV-XIX.

Eventually, *Vt*. XXII rejects all previous *Vts*. and says that we can manage because *yu* and *vu* show nasalization. The point is that the *y* and *v* of *yu* and *vu* are regarded as nasalized semivowels. Wherever that is the case - and we know that from tradition only -, *yu* and *vu* are replaced by *ana* and *aka*. Conversely, wherever in the A. *yu* and *vu* are mentioned without nasalization, they are not replaced by *ana* and *aka*.

9. The *Vārttikakāra* and Patañjali are aware of the problems created by the assumption that the *u* of *yu* and *vu* is an *it*-letter. This assumption leads to undesired applications of a number of rules based on *ugittva*. The final conclusion is that, if the *y* and *v* are nasalized, *yu* and *vu* will be replaced by *ana* and *aka*. If not nasalised, then no replacement. There is no grammatical operation conditioned by a nasalized *y*(*it*) or *v*(*it*), so even if they are assumed to be nasalized, as must be the case in P. 7.1.1, there is no difficulty.

10. Apparently, the text of the A. available to the *Vārttikakāra* or *Vārttikakāras* and to Patañjali does not contain indications of nasality of particular speechsounds. As stated under 9, above, in the present text of the A. no mention is made of a nasalized *y* or *v*. So the only option open to the commentators is to assume nasality when needed for the justification of forms.

Most of the 22 *Vts* on P. 7.1.1.1 can be dismissed as being unnecesssary. The one fact pointed out is that in five forms (see under 5, above) *yu* is not replaced by *aka*. Pāṇini may not have known these forms - they come from the *taddhita*-section and from *uṇādisūtras* - or he may have overlooked them. Compare *ATA*, Introduction, p. vii-viii. In dealing with these forms, the *Vārttikakāra* could have phrased just one *Vārttika* stating a prohibition of the *aka* / *ana* substitution. That would have saved him the trouble of going to the extent of phrasing 22 *Vts*.

7.1.2 ĀYAN-EY-ĪN-ĪY-IY-AḤ PHA-ḌHA-KHA-CCHA-GH-ĀṂ PRATYA-YĀDĪNĀM *'āyan, ey, īn, īy,* and *iy* (come) in place of *ph, ḍh, kh, ch* and *gh* in initial position of a suffix (respectively, coming after a nominal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of linguistic elements for (artificial) *upadeśa* elements. Compare P. 7.1.1.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *phaḍhakhachaghāṃ pratyayādīnām*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Aṅgāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. *Phaḍhakhachaghām pratyayādīnām* discontinues *yuvoḥ* from P. 7.1.1. It is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. The elements mentioned form the initial part of various *taddhita* suffixes. The purpose of the word *pratyayādīnām* is to make clear that *aṅgasya* (P. 6.4.1) is not to be taken in the sense of an *avayavāvayaviṣaṣṭhī* 'gen. case suffix conveying a part-whole relation,' as in P. 6.4.34 and 89. The *vidheya* is *āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ*. It discontinues *anakau* from P. 7.1.1. Since P. 7.1.2 contains an equal number of *sthānins* and *ādeśas*, P. 1.3.10 is applied.

3. The full forms of the suffixes meant are:

(a) *phaK* (P. 4.1.99), e.g., *nāḍāyanaḥ / cārāyaṇaḥ* 'a *gotra* descendant of Naḍa/ of Cara.'

(b) *ḍhaK* (P. 4.1.120), e.g., *sauparṇeyaḥ / vainateyaḥ* 'a descendant of Suparṇā/ of Vinatā'

(c) *kha* (P. 4.1.139), e.g., *āḍhyakulīṇaḥ / śrotriyakulīnaḥ* 'a descendant of a wealthy family / of a family of specialists in reciting the Veda'

(d) *cha* (P. 4.2.114), e.g., *gārgīyaḥ / vātsīyaḥ* 'a descendant of Gārgya / of Vātsya.' The *Nyāsa* explains that here P. 6.4.148 and 151 are applied for the deletion of *a* and *y* in *gārgya* and *vātsya*.

(e) *gh* (P. 4.1.138), e.g., *kṣatriyaḥ* 'a descendant of *kṣatra*'

4. To point out the significance of the mention of the word *pratyaya* 'suffix,' the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *phakkati* 'he goes down,' *ḍhaukate* 'he approaches,' *khanati* 'he digs,' *chinatti* 'he cuts off' and *ghūrṇati* 'he moves to and fro.' Here the *ph*, etc. occur in initial position of a verbal base *aṅga*. But once *aṅgāt* is continued, there is no possibility for *ph*, etc. to be replaced on account of being part of an *aṅga* (*aṅgasya*).

To point out the significance of the mention of the word *ādi* 'initial position,' the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *ūrudaghnam* 'reaching up to the thighs' (sg. nom. ntr.) and *jānudaghnam* 'reaching up to the knees' (sg. nom. ntr.). The *Nyāsa* explains that here the suffix *daghnaC* has been added by P. 5.2.37. Here the *gh* of *daghna* is not replaced by *iy*, because in does not occur in initial position of a suffix.

5. Referring to *Vt*. I on the rule, the *KV* explains that *āyan*, etc., come in place of *phaK*, etc., at the very time of the original enunciation of the latter. That is to say, *phaK*, etc., are not introduced without being replaced by *āyan*, etc., immediately. Once the substitutions have taken place, the suffixes become *ādyudātta* 'having high pitch on the first syllable.' In this way, the addition of C in the suffix *ghaC* mentioned in P. 4.4.117 becomes purposeful. Reference is to P. 6.1.163, which prescribes *antodātta* for a stem formed with a suffix containing the *anubandha* C. Suppose, *ghaC* is added to a stem. Being a suffix, *ghaC* is *ādyudātta* by P. 3.1.3. In the case of *ghaC*, this could only mean that the replacement vowel *i* (of *iy* replacing *gh*) is *udātta*. But P. 6.1.163 tells us that the sequence *iya* resulting from the replacement of *gh* in *ghaC* by *iy* is *antodātta*, because of the *anubandha* C. That is to say, unless C is there, the resulting form would be *ādyudātta*, which is not desired. This shows that the *anubandha* C in *ghaC* is purposeful.

6. Referring to *Vts* III and IV on the rule, the *KV* points out that in the words *śaṅkha* 'conch' and *ṣaṇḍha* 'thicket,' which are *uṇādi*-derivations, substitution of *kha* and *ḍha* does not take place because of the statement of *bahulam* 'variously' in P. 3.3.1. Or we may assume that P. 3.1.29 provides a clue, namely, that substitution (by P. 7.1.2) of *dhātupratyayas* 'suffixes added to verbal bases (only)' is not allowed. The argument is as follows. P. 3.1.29 prescribes the suffix *īyaṄ* after the verbal base quoted as *ṛtI*- 'to abhor.' According to the *SK*, No. 2422, on this rule, *ṛtI* is a *sautra* verbal base, only known from P. 3.1.129, and assumed to be a 2nd conjugation class verb. For the latter no reason has been stated. Thus, after applying P. 1.3.12 and P. 2.4.72, we derive *ṛtīyate* 'he abhors.' Now why not phrase the rule as *ṛter chaṄ* 'after (the verbal base quoted as) *ṛtI* (comes the suffix) *chaṄ* (which is replaced by *īya*)'? The answer is that, since the *sūtrakāra* prescribed *īyaṄ* in P. 3.1.29, it provides the clue that substitution of suffixes added to verbal bases by P. 7.1.2 is not allowed.

7. The *KV* further points out that in rules like P. 3.2.28 and P. 3.3.16 the designation *it* has to be applied, namely, to *KH* and *GH* by P. 1.3.8. P. 3.2.28 prescribes the (*kṛt*-)suffix *KHaŚ*, P. 3.3.16 the (*kṛt*-)-suffix *GHaÑ*. In both cases the actual suffix is *a*, the *KH* and *GH* in initial position being *anubandhas* which are *it* by P. 1.3.8 (and 9). Being *it*, they cannot be replaced by *īn* and *iy* respectively,

by P. 7.1.2, simply, because they are not there. So P. 7.1.2 has no scope here. Since this rule has scope in the case of *kh* and *gh* as initials of *taddhita* suffixes, it cannot set aside the *itsaṃjñā* in the case of *kṛt*-suffixes. But, according to P. 1.3.8, *ku*-sounds like *kh* and *gh* in initial position of *taddhita* suffixes are not *it*-letters. Therefore substitution by P. 7.1.2 can take place.

8. The *KV* finally raises the question why the *n* in final position of *āyan* and *īn* is not considered *it* by P. 1.3.3. If so, *āyan* and *īn* would be *Nit*. Since there is a chance for *āyan* and *īn* having *N* as an *it*-letter, a special provision has to be made, because a grammatical operation dependent on *Nittva* is available. Reference is to P. 6.1.197, which says that before a suffix marked with *N* the initial syllable of the stem is *ādyudātta*. However, *āyan*- and *īn*-derivations are not *ādyudātta*. For this we have a clue. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the clue is provided by P. 4.1.160. This rule says that, according to the easterners, the *taddhita* suffix *phiN* is variously added after a *vṛddha* stem in the sense of descendant. Here the *N* is an *anubandha* added to show that the word derived is *ādyudātta*, by P. 6.1.197, and *phi* is replaced by *āyan* by P. 7.1.1. From the fact that the *N* in *phiN* is an *it*-letter we infer that the *n* in *āyan* and *īn* is not. Otherwise, why add the *N* in *phiN*?

9. We have five *Vts* on the rule. The *Vts* I and II deal with *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like an element belonging to the *upadeśa*.' According to Patañjali, *Vts.* I says two things : (a) *Upadeśivadbhāva* has to be stated for *āyan*, etc., and (b) *Āyan*, etc. are to be introduced already in the *upadeśa*-stage. The purpose of (a) and (b) is to establish the right accent. An example quoted by Patañjali is *śileyam* 'what is as hard as rock.' The *prakriyā* might go as follows :

(1) *śilā'* + *ḍha*	P. 5.3.102
(2) *śilā* + *ḍhá*	P. 3.1.3
(3) *śilā* + *eyá*	P. 7.1.2
(4) *śailā* + *eyá*	P. 7.2.117
(5) *śail°* + *eyá*	P. 6.4.148
śaileyá.	

But this is not the desired form. We want *śailéya*. This is the form obtained by applying *upadeśivadbhāva*. Accordingly, the substitute of *dha* is treated like an element belonging to the original enunciation. That is to say, it will read *éya*, by P. 3.1.3. That gives us *śailéya*. The same reasoning applies to *taittirīya* 'a student of the Vedic recension promulgated by Tittiri.' Here the suffix *chaṆ* is added to *tittiri* by P. 4.3.102.

Vt. II rejects *Vt.* I. It says that on account of the addition of the *anubandha* C in some rule the statement of treating *āyan*, etc. like elements belonging to the *upadeśa* is purposeless. Patañjali explains that we have a clue which tells us that *āyan*, etc. are introduced already at the *upadeśa*-stage. See under 5, above. Therefore, we need not phrase a separate statement for *upadeśivadbhāva*. We can manage by the clue.

Vi. III-V deal with *uṇādi* suffix derivations. *Vt.* III says that a prohibition should be phrased, namely, of P. 7.1.2, in the case of *uṇādi* suffixes. The examples quoted by Patañjali are *śaṅkhaḥ* and *ṣaṇḍhaḥ*. See under 6, above.

Vt. IV says that, alternatively, we can have what we want on account of the statement of *īyaṄ* coming after a verbal base. See under 6, above.

Vt. V says that, moreover, it can be handled by Pāṇini, because we understand that the stems concerned come under the category of *prātipadika*. Patañjali explains that nominal stems derived with *uṇādi* suffixes are regarded as underivable stems in Pāṇini's system. See *PN*, *pbh*. 22. Being *uṇādi*-derivations, *śaṅkha* and *śaṇḍha* fall outside Pāṇini's grammatical system. Therefore a prohibition of P. 7.1.2 with regard to *uṇādi* suffixes as proposed by *Vt.* III need not be stated. For the expression *pāṇineḥ siddham* used in *Vt.* V compare *bhagavataḥ pāṇineḥ siddham* in *Vt.* IV on P. 8.4.68.

7.1.3 JHO 'NTAḤ '*ant* (comes) in place of *jh* (in initial position of a suffix coming after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *ant* for *jh* of the finite verb endings *jhi* and *jha*, mentioned in P. 3.4.78.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt pratyayādeḥ*) *jhaḥ*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Angāt* is a technical ablative by P. 1.1.67. The word *pratyayādeḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.2, as an *avayavāvayaviṣaṣṭhī* qualifying *jhaḥ*. The word *jhaḥ* is a technical genitive by P. 1.1.49. It discontinues *phaḍhakhacchām* from P. 7.1.2. The *vidheya* is *antaḥ*. It discontinues *āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ* from P. 7.1.2.

3. Following the *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* II on the present rule, the *KV* says that the word *ādi* from P. 7.1.2 is not continued. The reason, not stated by the *KV*, is found in the form *śayāntai* used in a Vedic passage borrowed by the *KV* from the *bhāṣya* on the same *Vt.* in a slightly different form. The *KV* version reads *adya śvo*

vijaniṣyamāṇāḥ patibhiḥ saha śāyāntai 'today, tomorrow let (the women) going to give birth to us lie down with their husbands' (*Vāsiṣṭha Gṛhyasūtra* 13.24 (?). *Śayāntai* is the *ātm.* 3rd pl. subjunctive of *śī-* 'to lie down.' See Whitney, § 558, 562, 574. In the Vedic language the use of the finite verb endings is not fixed like in Sanskrit. In the form quoted the finite verb ending *e* is preferably replaced by *ai* by P. 3.4.96. Moreover, by P. 3.4.94, the augment *āṬ* is inserted before the personal ending. Augments are assumed to form one unit with the element to which they are added. Compare *AP* IX, P. 6.4.71, under 2.Therefore the ending *jha* is assumed to read *ājha*. Here *jh* does not occur in initial position of the ending any more. Still, the application of P. 7.1.3 is desired. That is achieved by leaving out the word *ādi* 'in initial position.'

The *prakriyā* of *śāyantai* stated by the *Nyāsa* as assumed by the *KV* is as follows :

(1)	*śīṄ-*							*Dhp.* 2.22
(1)	*śī*					+	*lEṬ*	P. 3.4.8
(2)	*śī*					+	*jha*	P. 3.4.78
(3)	*śī*	+	*ŚaP*			+	*jha*	P. 3.1.68
(4)	*śī*	+	*a*	+	*āṬ*	+	*jha*	P. 3.4.94
(5)	*śī*	+	*a*	+	*ā*	+	*anta*	P. 7.1.3
(6)	*śī*	+	*a*	+	*ā*	+	*ante*	P. 3.4.79
(7)	*śī*	+	*a*	+	*ā*	+	*antai*	P. 3.4.96
(8)	*śī*	+	°	+	*ā*	+	*antai*	P. 2.4.73
(9)	*śe*			+	*ā*	+	*antai*	P. 7.4.21
(10)	*śay*			+	*ā*	+	*antai*	P. 6.1.78
(11)	*śay*			+	*āntai*			P. 6.1.90
	śayāntai.							

We note that here *jh* is replaced by *ant* only in a later stage of the *prakriyā*, namely, after the insertion of the augment *āṬ*.

Patañjali and the *KV* are wrong. The point is that the substitute *ant* must be treated as an element belonging to the original enunciation, just like *jha*. See P. 7.1.2, under 9. As soon as the *jh* of *jha* is introduced, it is replaced by *ant*. That is to say, the replacement of *jh* by *ant* happens before the introduction of the augment *āṬ*. This being so, the *jh* is still in initial position of the suffix. Consequently, the word to be continued in P. 7.1.3 is *pratyayādeḥ*.

4. The examples offered by the *KV* are *kurvanti* 'they do,' *sunvanti* 'they press (Soma)' and *cinvanti* 'they pile up.' Referring to *uṇādisūtra* 413 (*SK*, p. 545) *jṛviśibhyāṃ jhaC* 'after (the verbal bases *jṝ-* "to make old" and *viś-* "to enter" (the suffix) *jhaC* (is added)', the *KV* quotes the forms *jarantaḥ* 'old' and *veśantaḥ* (meaning un-known) as examples.

5. To point out the significance of the word *pratyaya* without *ādi*, the *KV* following *Vt*. I on the present rule quotes the counterexamples *ujjhitum* 'in order to abandon' and *ujjhitavyam* 'what ought to be abandoned.' Here the suffixes *tumUN* (P. 3.3.10) and *tavyaT* (P. 3.1.96) have been added. But in the examples quoted *jh* is not part of a suffix.

6. Finally, the *KV* points out that even after the substitution of *ant* for *jha* has taken place, the substitute suffix remains *ādyudātta* 'having high pitch on the first syllable,' namely, by P. 3.1.3. Similarly, the addition of C in *jhaC* is purposeful. Therefore here the substitute *ant* is *antodātta*. Reference is to P. 6.1.163. See P. 7.1.2, under 5.

We note that augments are always *anudātta*, unless a special prescription for accent is given, like in P. 6.4.71. See *AP* IX, P. 6.4.71, under 2, where the relevant *Mbh.*- passage is quoted. See also *Paribhāṣā-saṃgraha*, p. 42, under *Vyāḍiparibhāṣā* No. 105, which says *āgamā anudāttāḥ*.

7. We have six *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that with regard to the rule prescribing the replacement of *jh* a prohibition should be phrased (for *jh*) at the end of a verbal base. The examples quoted by Patañjali are *ujjhitā* 'one who abandons' and *ujjhitum* 'in order to abandon.' See under 5, above. Patañjali rejects the *Vt*. He thinks that we can manage by the word *pratyaya* continued in P. 7.1.3 from P. 7.1.2. In *ujjhitā*, etc., the *jh* obviously is not part of a *pratyaya*.

Vt. II is an *iti ced Vt*. It says that, if we can manage because of the mention of *pratyaya* in the heading rule P. 7.1.2, then a statement should be made for the substitution of *ant* for *jh* which is not in initial position (of a suffix). Patañjali quotes the example *śayāntai* from a Vedic passage which reads *api naḥ śvo vijaniṣyamāṇāḥ patibhiḥ saha śayāntai* 'are they (women) going to give birth to us tomorrow? Let them lie down with their husbands.' In his *bhāṣya* Patañjali argues that in P. 7.1.3 the word *ādi* from *pratyayādīnām* in P. 7.1.2 is discontinued. See under 3, above.

Vt. III says that we can manage by assuming that *pratyayādīnām* in P. 7.1.2 is a mention not forming a compound.That is to say, *pratyayādīnām* should be

understood as the uncompounded expression *pratyayasya ādīnām*, 'in place of phonemes in initial position of a suffix.' Now, if *pratyayasya* is continued and *ādi* is discontinued, then P. 7.1.3 can be applied to the sequence *ā* + *jha*, in which *ā* is an augment forming one unit with *jha*, even if *jha* does not occur at the beginning of a suffix. See stage (4) of the *prakriyā* of *śayāntai* stated in connection with P. 7.1.2, under 3.

Patañjali tries to improve on *Vt.* III. The text should be kept as it is. How then? As an *avibhaktiko nirdeśaḥ* 'the mention (of a word) without case ending.' Thus *pratyayādīnām* is understood as *pratyaya ādīnām*. The difference with Kātyāyana's idea of the mention of an uncompounded expression is that in Patañjali's version *pratyaya* is not changed into *pratyayasya*. In both cases the word *ādi* from P. 7.1.2 is discontinued, and we can justify the application of P. 7.1.3 to forms in which *jha* does not represent the beginning of a suffix. Apparently, the question of *upadeśivadbhāva* is left out of account. See under 3, above.

Vt. IV says that, this being so, a prohibition is to be phrased of the substitution of *at* (for *jha*), because the *aṅga* in *śayāntai* does not end in short *a*. Reference is to P. 7.1.5 This rule prescribes the substitution of *at* for *jh* of *jha*, if the preceding *aṅga* does not end in short *a*. In fact, after the *luk*-deletion of *ŚaP*, the verbal stem (*aṅga*) is *śī*, which obviously does not end in short *a*. Therefore P. 7.1.5 is applicable. The resulting undesired form would be **śayātai*.

Vt. V argues that, still, we can manage without a prohibition as proposed by *Vt.* IV, because the substitution of *at* for *jh* (by P. 7.1.5) is suspended due to the word *anataḥ* 'except if *jha* is immediately preceded by an *aṅga* which does not end in short *a*' (in P. 7.1.5). The argument is as follows. The prohibition in P. 7.1.5, *anataḥ*, is explained to mean *anakārāntāt aṅgāt* 'immediately following (P. 1.1.67) after an *anga* not ending in short *a*.' Now the question is raised, which is the immediately following element? Is it *pratyaya* / *pratyayasya*, or is it *jha*? If *anakārāntāt aṅgāt* qualifies *pratyaya* / *pratyayasya*, then the further question is, whether *jha* is itself the *pratyaya*, or part of a *pratyaya*, namely, *ājha*. In the derivational stage *śī* + *ā* + *jha*, if *jha* is part of the *pratyaya ājha*, then P. 7.1.5 applies, because the condition of immediate sequence is met. *Ājha* follows immediately after the *aṅga* *śī*. Consequently, *jh* would be replaced by *at*. If, on the other hand, *anakārāntāt aṅgāt* qualifies *jha*, the ending *jha* must follow immediately after an *anga* not ending in short *a*. But in *śī* + *ā* + *jha* this condition is not met, because *ā* intervenes. Thus P. 7.1.5 cannot become applicable. The result is the form *śayāntai*, as desired. Thus, the conclusion is that *anakārāntāt aṅgāt* qualifies *jha*.

Vt. VI says that, this (the argument of *Vt*. V) being so, we can manage on account of the statement of *saṃniyoga* 'conjunction' in (the rule prescribing) *rUṬ*. Reference is to P. 7.1.6 which prescribes the augment *rUṬ* together with the *at*-replacement of *jha* when following immediately after *śī*-. *Saṃniyoga*, also known as *samāveśa* 'joint application,' is a meaning of the particle *ca*. Kātyāyana's idea is to add *ca* in P. 7.1.6. Patañjali in his *bhāṣya* puts it like this : *ka eṣa yatnaś codyate saṃniyogo nāma. Cakāraḥ kartavyaḥ* 'what kind of objective is intended by saying *samniyoga*? (Answer) The particle *ca* should be added.' Thereby we obtain two rules, (a) *śīṅaḥ* '(*jha*) coming immediately after *śīṄ*- (is replaced by *at*),' and (b) *ruc ca* 'and (the augment) *rUṬ* (is added, namely, to *at*).' Here *ca* has a conjunctive value, so that the (a) and (b) rules are applied conjointly in one and the same derivation. See *FANU*, p. 98-99.

What is the difficulty? That can be shown with the help of the *prakriyā* of *śerate* 'they lie down' in the *Vārttikakāra's* version, as follows :

(1) *śīṄ*-			*Dhp*. 2.22
(2) *śī*		+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.4.123
(3) *śī*		+ *jha*	P. 1.3.12; 3.4.78
(4) *śī*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *jha*	P. 3.1.68
(5) *śī*	+ °	+ *jha*	P. 2.4.72
(6) *śī*	+ *rUṬ*	+ *jha*	P. 7.1.6

At this stage, we cannot apply P. 7.1.5, because here *jha* is not immediately preceded by the *aṅga śī*, which does not end in short *a*. The augment *rUṬ* intervenes. Consequently, we have to apply P. 7.1.3, which leads to the wrong form, namely, **śerante*, instead of *śerate*. To prevent this difficulty, *Vt*. VI introduces the idea of *samniyoga*, as explained above. Thereby, according to P. 7.1.6, the augment *rUṬ* applies conjointly with the *at*-substitute.

Patañjali objects that, still, *paryāya* 'application in turn,' namely, of the augment *rUṬ* and the *at*-substitute, might result, instead of their being applied jointly. To remove this difficulty, Patañjali says that the word *at* should be continued from P. 7.1.4 in P. 7.1.6. In P. 7.1.4 *at* is a nominative form, continued in P. 7.1.5. It is also continued P. 7.1.6. Thus this rule says *śīṅaḥ at rut*. Here *śīṅah* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67, to be interpreted as *śīṅaḥ uttarasya*. How to connect *uttarasya*? It cannot be construed with *rUṬ*, because *rUṬ* is the *vidheya*. Therefore *uttarasya* must be connected with *at*. Consequently, on the basis of the abl. form *śīṅaḥ*, the word *at* from P. 7.1.4 is interpreted as a gen. form, namely, *ataḥ*, by *vibhaktivipariṇāma*. Thus P. 7.1.6 comes to mean *śīṅaḥ uttarasya ataḥ ruṭ* '*rUṬ* (is to

be added as an initial sound) to *at* which follows immediately after *śī-*.' In this way, *rUṬ* is not an intervening element between *śī-* and the substitute *at*. In other words, a stage in the *prakriyā* reading *śī* + *rUṬ* + *jha* is ruled out, because *rUṬ* can only be applied, if the substitute *at* is there. This is the point of *saṃniyoga*. Therefore the final *prakriyā*-stages of *śerate* are as follows :

(6) *śī*	+ *rUṬ*	+ *ata*		P. 7.1.6 (a) and (b)
(7) *śī*	+ *r*	+ *ate*		P. 3.4.79
(8) *śe*	+ *r*	+ *ate*		P. 7.1.21
śerate.				

We note that Patañjali's solution of the difficulty is different from that of the *Vārttikakāra*, and that the *KV* makes no mention of the *Vārttikakāra's* proposal of *saṃniyoga*. In the *prakriyā*-version of the *Vārttikakāra* and of the *KV* P. 7.1.5 (the *at*-substitution for *jh* in the case of *ātm.* verbal bases) and P. 7.1.6 (the insertion of the augment *rUṬ*) take place in succession in two separate stages of the *prakriyā*. Later on, in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* II on P. 7.1.6, Patañjali makes it clear that he rejects the *Vārttikakāra's* proposal to add *ca* to P. 7.1.3, and thus to split the rule. *Yathānyāsam evāstu* (*Mbh.* III, p. 243, line 7).

8. Actually, taking into account *upadeśivadbhāva* (see P. 7.1.2, under 8), *jha* has no existence independently from the corresponding linguistic representation *anta* (P. 7.1.3), or *ata* (P. 7.1.5), or other representations, like *ran* (P. 3.4.105). In the present case, however, an environment changing rule (*śabluk*, P. 2.4.72) becomes operative subsequently. Consequently, we cannot apply the *anta*-substitution, because the verbal stem (*aṅga*) no longer ends in *a*. For instance, in *bhū* + *ŚaP* + *jhi* → *bhav* + *a* + *anti* (P. 7.1.3) the *aṅga bhava* ends in short a. Therefore P. 7.1.5, which is conditioned by *anataḥ* 'after a verbal stem not ending in short *a*, cannot become applicable. But in *śī* + ° + *jha*, because of the *luk*-deletion of *ŚaP*, the verbal stem does not end in short *a*. That is why we have to apply P. 7.1.5. That is to say, the *at*-substitution is applied, because the *śabluk* is *siddha* 'having taken effect.' Once P. 7.1.5 is applied, P. 7.1.6 becomes applicable for *śī-*, and *rUṬ* is added.

7.1.4 AD ABHYASTĀT '*at* (comes in place of *jh* in initial position of a suffix) coming after a reduplicated (verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *at* for *jh* of the finite verb endings *jhi or jha* on the condition (reduplication) stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *abhyastāt* (*aṅgāt pratyayādeḥ jhaḥ*). The term *abhyasta* in the A. is used to refer to a reduplicated verbal base. A definition is found in P. 6.1.5. Regularly reduplicated verbal bases are those of the 3rd conjugation class. But P. 6.1.6 extends the designation *abhyasta* to six other verbal bases which are enumerated. The technical abl. *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Pratyayādeḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.2. The technical gen. *jhaḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.3. The *vidheya* is *at*. It discontinues *anta* from P. 7.1.3.

3. The *Nyāsa* notes that the present rule is mainly meant for non-*ātmanepada* forms only, because *ātmanepada* forms can be taken care of by the next rule. The point is that here the *aṅga* does not end in *ŚaP* after this *vikaraṇa* has been *Ślu*-deleted by P. 2.4.75.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *dadati* 'they give,' *dadatu* 'they must give,' *dadhati* 'they place,' *dadhatu* 'they must place,' *jakṣati* 'they have eaten,' *jakṣatu* 'they must eat,' *jāgrati* 'they are awake' and *jāgratu* 'they must be awake.' For *jakṣ-* see Whitney, § 640, and for *jāgr-* § 1020 a. According to the *Dhp*. (2.62 and 63), they are 2nd conjugation class verbal bases. Still, they are called *abhyasta* 'reduplicated' by P. 6.1.6.

The *prakriyā* of the *lAṬ*- form *dadati* is as follows :

(1)	*ḌUdāÑ-*		*Dhp.* 3.9
(2)	*dā*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3)	*dā*	+ *jhi*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*dā* + *ŚaP*	+ *jhi*	P. 3.1.68
(5)	*dā* + °	+ *jhi*	P. 2.4.75
(6)	*dā* + *dā*	+ *jhi*	P. 6.1.10
(7)	*da* + *dā*	+ *jhi*	P. 7.4.59
(8)	*da* + *dā*	+ *ati*	P. 7.1.4
(9)	*da* + *d°*	+ *ati*	P. 6.4.112
	dadati.		

The only difference with the derivation of the *lOṬ* 3rd pl. form *dadatu* consists in this that the *i* of *ati* is replaced by *u* by P. 3.4.86.

5. The *KV* notes that the present rule is an *apavāda* 'special rule' in relation to the *ant*-substitution prescribed by P. 7.1.3. But it is set aside by the prescription of the 3rd pl. impf. ending *jUS* for *jhi* by P. 3.4.109. As explained by the *Nyāsa*,

reference is to *PN*, *pbh*. 62, which is quoted in an expanded version as *pūrvaṃ apavādāḥ pravartante paścād utsargāḥ, parihṛtyāpavādaviṣayaṃ utsargāḥ pravartante* 'first special rules are applied, then the general rules. After having eliminated the domain of the special rules, the general rules apply.' The examples are *adadhuḥ* 'they placed' and *ajāgaruḥ* 'they were awake.' Here P. 7.1.4, which is itself an exception to P. 7.4.3, is set aside by the special rule P. 3.4.109.

6. Finally, the *KV* notes after the substitution has taken place, the first syllable of the replacement suffix will have high pitch by P. 3.1.3. But this is set aside for *abhyasta* forms by P. 6.1.189. This rule says that here the first syllable of the reduplicating form has high pitch. Thus we have *dádati* and *dádatu*, etc.

7. There is no *bhaṣya* on the rule.

7.1.5 ĀTMANEPADEṢV ANATAḤ 'when the question is of *ātmanepada* endings (*at* comes in place of *jh* in initial position of a suffix after a verbal base *aṅga*) which does not end in short *a*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *at* for *jh* of the *ātm.* ending *jha*, on a particular condition.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ātmanepadeṣu anataḥ* (*aṅgāt pratyayādeḥ jhaḥ*). Here *ātmanepadeṣu* is a *viṣayasaptamī*. *Anat* is interpreted as *anatanta* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Anataḥ* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. *Aṅgāt* is a technical abl. continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Pratyayādeḥ* is continiued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 4.1.2. *Jhaḥ* is a technical gen., continued from P. 7.1.3. The word *abhyastāt* from P. 7.1.4 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. The *Padamañjarī* states that the present rule is meant for non-*abhyasta* verbal bases. The *vidheya* is (*at*), continued from P. 7.1.4.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *cinvate* 'they pile up,' *cinvatām* 'they must pile up,' *acinvata* 'they piled up,' *punate* 'they clean,' *lunate* 'they clean,' *lunatām* 'they must mow' and *alunata* 'they mowed.'

The *prakriyā* of *punate* is as follows:

(1) *pūÑ-*		*Dhp.* 9.12
(2) *pū*	+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3) *pū*	+ *jha*	P. 3.4.78; 1.3.12
(4) *pū* + *Śnā*	+ *jha*	P. 3.1.81

(5) *pū* + *n°*	+ *jha*	P. 6.4.112
(6) *pū* + *n*	+ *ata*	P. 7.1.5
(7) *pū* + *n*	+ *ate*	P. 3.4.79
(8) *pu* + *n*	+ *ate*	P. 7.3.80
punate.		

4. To point out the significance of the word *ātmanepadeṣu*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *cinvanti* 'they pile up' and *lunanti* 'they mow.'

To point out the significance of the condition *anataḥ*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *cyavante* 'they trickle' and *plavante* 'they float.' The *KV* explains that after the *vikaraṇa ŚaP* has been introduced here because it is *nitya* 'invariably applicable' we have to replace *jha* by *anta* The point made is like this. At the stage *cyu / plu + jha* two rules become applicable. They are the *ŚaP*-rule (P. 3.1.68) and P. 7.1.5. Out of these two rules the *ŚaP*-rule is *nitya*. Thus it applies whether we apply P. 7.1.5, or not. But if we apply P. 3.1.68 first, we cannot apply P. 7.1.5 any more, because now the *aṅga* (*śī* + *ŚaP*) ends in *a*. Therefore P. 7.1.5 must be an *anitya* 'not invariably applicable' rule. Then which rule to apply? Out of a *nitya* rule and an *anitya* rule, the first is considered to be stronger. See *PN*, *pbh*. 42. Therefore we apply the *ŚaP*-rule, which leads to the desired result.

Actually, what we have here is a one-way conflict. See *ABORI*, Vol. LXVIII. Poona 1987, p. 542. The application of P. 3.1.68 changes the environment in which P. 7.1.5 was to become applicable, but the reverse is not the case. This being so, the environment changing rule is to be applied, in our case, P. 3.1.68. Instead of using the term *nitya*, we prefer to use the term *siddha*.

What is the point of *anakārāntāt aṅgāt* qualifying *jhah*? So that the rule does not apply to *śayāntai* in *adya śvo vijaniṣyamāṇāḥ patibhiḥ saha śayāntaī* 'today, tomorrow going to give birth, let them lie with their husbands.' Compare P. 7.1.3, under 3. The point is that the qualification mentioned implies that the verbal base *aṅga* must immediately precede *jha*. In *śayānte* this is not the case because between *śī* and *jha* the augment *ā* intervenes See P. 7.1.3, under 7 (*Vt.* V).

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.6 ŚĪṄO RUṬ '(the augment) *rUṬ* (is added) to *at* which comes in place of *jh* in initial position of a suffix following immediately after (the verbal base *aṅga*) *śĪṄ*- "to lie down" '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *rUṬ* for *at*, provided that *at* comes in place of *jh* after *śī*-.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *śīṅaḥ* (*ataḥ pratyayādeḥ jhaḥ*). Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) as a technical abl. from P. 6.4.1. *Śīṅaḥ* is a technical abl. (P. 1.1.67). *Ataḥ* is an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.4. *Pratyayādeḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.2. *Jhaḥ* is a technical gen. (P. 1.1.49), continued from P. 7.1.3. The *vidheya* is *rUṬ*. According to P. 1.1.46, since *rUṬ* has been provided with the *anubandha Ṭ*, the augment forms the initial part of the element to which is has been added.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *śerate* 'they lie down,' *śeratām* 'let them lie down' and *aśerata* 'they lied down.' For a discussion on *śerate* see P. 7.1.3, under 7 (*Vt.* VI). The irregularity of these *śī*- formations has been noticed by Whitney, §§ 613 and 629.

4. The *KV* notes that *rUṬ* is added at the beginning of the following element. Thus the element concerned reads *rat*. If *rUṬ* would be added to *jh* only, then, since *r* intervenes between *śī*- and *jha*, we couldn't replace *jha* by *at*. That is why the augment has been prescribed for the substitute *at* only.

5. The *KV* notes that the mention of *śī*- with the *anubandha Ṅ* is for the sake of *yaṅluk*. That is to say, P. 7.1.5 does not apply to *yaṅluk* formations. Compare *PN*, *pbh*. 120 (3). This *pbh*. sums up five operations concerning verbal bases which are not applicable to *yaṅluk* formations. One of these is an operation prescribed for a verbal base provided with an *anubandha*. Therefore the rule does not apply in the case of *vyatiśeśyate* 'they surpass each other again and again.'

The shortened *prakriyā* of *vyatiśeśyate* is as follows:

(1)	*vi + ati + śī + śī + yaṄ + ŚaP + jha*	P. 6.1.9; 3.1.22, etc.
(2)	*vi + ati + śī + śī + ya + ° + jha*	P. 2.4.72 (*gaṇasūtra, carkarītaṃ ca*)
(3)	*vi + ati + śī + śī + ° + jha*	P. 2.4.74
(4)	*vy + ati + śe + śī + ata*	P. 6.1.77; 7.4.82; 7.1.5
(5)	*vyati + śe + śī + ate*	P. 3.4.79

At this stage, the ending *ate* follows immediately after *śī*-. Therefore P. 7.1.6 becomes applicable. But its application would derive the undesired form *vyatiśeśī-r-ate*. This is prevented by *PN, pbh.* 120 (3). Since the *anubandha* Ṅ has been added to *śī*- in P. 7.1.6, this rule is not to be applied in the case of *yaṅluk* formations. The *prakriyā* then continues as follows :

(6) *vyati* + *śe* + *śy* + *ate* P. 6.4.82
vyatiśeśyate.

Usually, *yaṅluk* formations are *parasmaipadin* (P. 3.1.78). To have the *ātm.* ending, *vyati* is added. Reference is to P. 1.3.14.

6. We have five *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that a prohibition should be phrased for *guṇa* (substitution) in the verbal base *dṛś*- 'to see,' when *rUṬ* follows immediately. The question is, *guṇa* by which rule?

The example quoted by Patañjali is *adṛśrann asya ketavaḥ*. This is a Vedic quotation (ṚgV.1.50.3), which in the *Vaidika-Saṃśodhana Maṇḍal* ed. of the ṚgVeda (Vol. I, Pune 1995, p. 348) actually reads *adṛśram*. Both forms are traditionally taken to be Vedic aor. (*lUṄ*) forms, a sg. first person and a pl. 3rd person in which the augment *rUṬ* has been added by P. 7.1.8. Both the *KV* and Kaiyaṭa follow Patañjali's explanation of the form. The form *adṛśran* is used in the ṚgVeda more frequently than *adṛśram* of which two instances are attested only (1.50.3 and 10.30.13). Whitney, § 834 b. notes that the ending *ran* is especially frequent in the 3rd pl. aor., and adds that *ram* is found beside *ran* in *adṛśram* and two other forms. Compare ibid. § 650 d. *Ran* is the regular 3rd pl. opt. ending prescribed by P. 3.4.195.

In his commentary Sāyaṇa notes that here the first person sg. is to be taken as a pl. form by the maxim *tiṅāṃ tiṅo bhavanti* 'in place of personal endings (other) personal endings are used.' Compare P. 3.1.85, and *Mbh.* I, p. 315, line 6, *vā chandasi sarve vidheyo bhavanti* 'in the Veda all rules are optional.' An instance referred to (line 13) is *puruṣavyatyayaḥ* 'interchange of persons.' K.F. Geldner, *Der Rig-Veda. Erster Teil*, p. 61, translates the words quoted as *'seine Vorzeichen...sind...sichtbar geworden.'* Apparently, *adṛśran* here requires a passive sense. Reference is to the sun.

The *prakriyā* of *adṛśran* as an aor. form is as follows :

(1) *dṛśIR*- *Dhp.* 1.1037

(2)	*dṛś*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(3)	*aṬ* + *dṛś*		+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *Cli*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.1.43
(5)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *aṄ*	+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.1.57
(6)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *a*	+ *jhi*	P. 3.4.78
(7)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *a*	+ *anti*	P. 7.1.3
(8)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *a*	+ *ant*	P. 3.4.100
(9)	*a* + *dṛś* + *rUṬ*	+ *a*	+ *ant*	P. 7.1.8
(10)	*a* + *dṛs* + *r*	+	*ant*	P. 6.1.97

Here the sequence *rant* is considered to be one unit, that is, one suffix. According to *PN*, *pbh*. 11, the augment which has been added to an element forms part of that element, and the resulting combination as a whole is referred to by the term which originally referred to the element to which the augment has been added. Thus the suffix *rant* is considered to include *aṄ*. This being so, the *guṇa*-rule P. 7.4.16 becomes applicable. According to the *Vārttikakāra*, its application should be prohibited. Thus the *prakriyā* continues :

(11)	*a* + *dṛś* + *r*	+ *an°*	P. 8.2.23
	adṛśran.		

Patañjali first notes that for *adṛśran*, the prohibition is not required. The *guṇa*-substitution has already been prohibited by P. 1.1.5, in which *kṅiti* is taken as a *parasaptamī* in the sense of 'if a suffix marked with *K* or *Ṅ* follows,' and not in the sense of a *nimittasaptamī* in the sense of 'if caused by a following suffix marked with *K* or *Ṅ*.' See *AP* I, p. 6. We note that Patañjali while discussing the prohibition or non-prohibition of *guṇa* takes into account the personal ending. He leaves the *vikaraṇa aṄ* out of account.

Let us consider the argument in more detail. Patañjali does not say by which rule *guṇa* is applicable. The *KV* on P. 7.1.8 assumes that *guṇa* is applicable in *adṛśram* (reading provided by the Hyderabad ed.) by P. 7.4.16. This rule says *ṛdṛśo aṅi guṇaḥ* 'for *ṛ* (short or long of an *aṅga*) and of *dṛś*- *guṇa* is substituted, if (the suffix) *aṄ* follows immediately.' As stated above, *aṄ* is the substitute of the aor. marker *Cli*. In the stage *a* + *dṛś* + *rUṬ* + *aṄ* + *ant* the condition of immediate sequence (P. 1.1.66) is not met, because *rUṬ* intervenes between the *aṅga* and *ant*. Therefore P. 7.4.16 cannot apply. On the other hand, in *adṛśran* the *guṇa*-substitution rule P. 7.4.86 is applicable because *rant*, that is, *rUṬ* + *aṄ* + *ant*, is considered to be a *sārvadhātuka* suffix (P. 3.4.113) as a whole. According to P. 1.2.4, this suffix is *Ṅit*. Accordingly, *guṇa* is prohibited by P. 1.1.5. Thus, to justify *adṛśran*, *Vt*. I is

not required. But then Patañjali observes that, even if P. 1.1.5 can be invoked for prohibiting *guṇa* in *adṛśran*, *guṇa* will still be applicable in the aor. first person sg. *adṛśram*. The first person sg. ending is *miP*. Being *Pit*, it cannot be *Ṅit*. But in *adṛśram* the prohibition of *guṇa* is also desired. Therefore, to justify *adṛśram*, *Vt*. I must be accepted.

For the *guṇa*-substitution before an augmented ending compare *bhaviṣyati* 'he will become.' The suffix is *sya* (P. 3.1.33). It is called *ārdhadhātuka* by P. 3.4.114. After the augment *iṬ* has been added (P. 7.2.35) the sequence *iṣya* as a whole becomes *ārdhadhātuka*. See *PN*, *pbh*. 11. Therefore the *guṇa*-substitution rule P. 7.3.84 becomes applicable, and we can derive the form as desired.

The question may be raised whether Patañjali's explanation of *Vt*. I is correct, and whether a different explanation can be provided. Consider the following. In the sequence verbal base + *vikaraṇa* + personal ending *guṇa* may or may not be applied to the verbal base vowel, depending on the *vikaraṇa*. In *bhū* + *ŚaP* + *tiP*, the *vikaraṇa ŚaP* being *Pit*, *guṇa* by P. 7.3.84 is applied. On the other hand, in *tud* + *Śa* + *tiP*, the *vikaraṇa Śa* (P. 3.1.77; 3.4.113) is *apit*, and therefore *Ṅit* by P. 1.2.4. That is why *guṇa* is prohibited by P. 1.1.5. Even though the personal ending *tiP* is *Pit*, *guṇa* due to *tiP* cannot be applied because *Śa* intervenes. But when we have the sequence verbal base + personal ending in which the *vikaraṇa* has been *luk*-deleted, *guṇa* due to the personal ending is applicable, because the condition of immediate sequence is met. For instance, in *dveṣmi* 'I hate' *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel is applied due to the immediately following first person sg ending *miP* which is *sārvadhātuka* and *Pit*. On the other hand, in *dviṣvaḥ* 'the two of us hate,' since *vas* is *apit* and therefore *Ṅit*, *guṇa* is prohibited by P. 1.1.5.

Now return to *adṛśram* / *adṛśran*, analysed as augment + verbal base + *rUṬ* + *aṄ* + personal ending. Here *aṄ* is the *vikaraṇa*. Taking into account what was stated above we assume that the question whether the personal ending is *Ṅit* or not is not relevant. Then how to explain *Vt*. I? In order to do so satisfactorily, we propose that *adṛśram* / *adṛśran* are Vedic impf. (*lAṄ*) forms, and not aor. (*lUṄ*) forms. The *prakriyā* of *adṛśram* will then be as follows :

(2)	*dṛś*	+ *lAṄ*	P. 3.2.111
(3)	*aṬ* + *dṛś*	+ *lAṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *mIP*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*a* + *dṛś* + *ŚaP*	+ *mi*	P. 3.1.68
(6)	*a* + *dṛś* + °	+ *mi*	P. 2.4.73

Since *ŚaP* is *luk*-deleted (P. 1.1.63), *dṛś* is not replaced by *paśya* by P. 7.3.78. The *prakriyā* then continues :

(7)	*a* + *dṛś*	+ *am*	P. 3.4.101
(8)	*a* + *dṛs*	+ *rUṬ*+ *am*	P. 7.1.8
	adṛśram.		

The ending *ram* is both *sārvadhātuka* and *Pit*. Therefore *guṇa* is applicable by P. 7.3.86. But *guṇa* is not desired here. A prohibition is required. This is what *Vt* I is for.

What about *adṛśran*? In the *prakriyā* the *vikaraṇa ŚaP* is added and *luk*-deleted, like before. The ending *jha* is replaced by *anta* (P. 7.1.3). After the addition of *rUṬ* the ending becomes *rant* which finally becomes *ran* (P. 8.2.23). *Jha* is *apit*, and therefore *Ṅit*. Accordingly, P. 1.1.5 will prohibit *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel, which is desired. There is not need for a separate statement prohibiting *guṇa*. Thus Patañjali is correct on both accounts: *Vt*. I is required for *adṛśram*, but not for *adṛśran*. Only his argument to reach this conclusion is incorrect.

Vt. II says that a prescription for *guṇa* of *śī* (is required), if the augment is (regarded as) the final element of the preceding unit. The example quoted by Patañjali is *śerate* 'they lie down.' See P. 7.1.3, under 7 (*Vt*. VI). Thus the analysis for the form to which *guna* is still to be applied is not *śī* + *rate*, but *śīr* + *ate*. In the latter form the *r* occurs in final position of the *aṅga śī*.

Suppose, the augment is not mentioned as *rUṬ*, but as *rUK*. In that case, it will be regarded as the final element of the preceding unit by P. 1.1.46. Now, we have no difficulty in justifying the form *adṛśran*. The analysis will be *adṛśr* + *an*. Here we cannot apply P. 7.3.84 for *guṇa*, because the *aṅga* does not end in an *iK* vowel. Nor can we apply P. 7.4.86, because there is no *laghu* vowel in prefinal position. Therefore no separate prohibition of *guṇa* is required. We can manage as it is.

But we do have a difficulty in deriving the form *śerate* 'they lie down.' On the same supposition as stated above (*rUK*, instead of *rUṬ*) the preceding unit after which *jha* is added will be *śīr*. Here we cannot apply *guṇa* by the special rule P. 7.4.21, because the *aṅga* is not *śī* any more. Nor can we apply P. 7.3.86, because the vowel in prefinal position is not *laghu*. In addition, the finite verb ending *ate* is *apit* by P. 1.2.4. Being *apit*, it will be considered *Ṅit*. Therefore *guṇa is* prohibited by P. 1.1.5. Still, *guṇa* is desired. But for that purpose we have to analyse the form

as sī + rate, where the augment is rUṬ occurring in initial position of the unit rate. Here P. 7.4.21 is applicable for guṇa. To solve the difficulty, Patañjali rejects the Vārttikakāra's proposal to split P. 7.1.3 into two rules (Vt. VI on P. 7.1.3), and says that the rule is better kept as it is. In fact, it should be interpreted to mean that at as the substitute for jha takes the augment rUṬ. Thereby we can take care of śerate. On the other hand, he accepts Vt. I on P. 7.1.6. Thereby we can take care of adṛśran.

Patañjali concludes his bhāṣya by saying that in both cases, whether r is taken with the preceding aṅga, or with the following jha-substitute, a statement in the form of dṛśer aK 'after (the verbal base quoted as) dṛśI- aK (is added, instead of aṄ)' is required to justify usages like pitaraṃ ca dṛśeyaṃ mātaraṃ ca dṛśeyaṁ 'may I see my father and may I see my mother' (RgV. 1.24.1). Reference is to Vt. II on P. 3.1.86 which quotes the example. Patañjali adds that aK is a different suffix, namely, from aṄ. The point here is that aṄ would trigger off the application of P. 7.4.16, which prescribes guṇa for dṛś- before aṄ. Once aṄ has been debarred, guṇa for dṛś- by P. 7.4.16 is also debarred.

P. 3.1.86 deals with chandas. It says that in the Vedic language the suffix aṄ is used, if an āśīrlin suffix follows immediately. Āśīrlin suffixes in the Vedic language may be ārdhadhātuka or sārvadhātuka (P. 3.4.117). The Vt. specifically says that in the Vedic language after dṛś- the suffix aK is added. The prakriyā of dṛśeyam is as follows:

(1) dṛśIR-					Dhp. 1.1037
(2) dṛś				+ lIṄ	P. 3.3.173
(3) dṛś		+ yāsUṬ		+ lIṄ	P. 3.4.103 (yāsUṬ is an augment prefixed to lIṄ by P. 1.1.46)
(4) dṛś		+ yās		+ miP	P. 3.4.78; PN, pbh.12
(5) dṛś	+ aK	+ yās		+ mi	Vt. II on P. 3.1.86
(6) dṛś	+ a	+ yās	+ sUṬ	+ mi	P. 3.4.107
(7) dṛś	+ a	+ yā°	+ °	+ mi	P. 7.2.79
(8) dṛś	+ a	+ yā		+ am	P. 3.4.101
(9) dṛś	+ a	+ iy		+ am	P. 7.2.80
(10) dṛś	+ ey			+ am	P. 6.1.87
dṛśeyam.					

Thus, whereas for dṛśeyam it makes a difference whether we apply aK or aṄ, no such difference shows when adṛśram and adṛśran are treated as aor. forms.

Consider the stages *a + dṛś + rUṬ / rUk + aK + jha* and *a + dṛś + rUṬ / rUK* i + *aṄ + jha*. In both cases *guṇa* is not applicable, because *rUṬ / rUK* intervenes. Actually, introducing *aK* here is pointless.

Vt. III says that on account of the substitution of *jha* the augment *āṬ* is added, if *lEṬ* follows immediately. *ĀṬ* is one of the two augments mentioned in P. 3.4.94. *LEṬ* is the Vedic subjunctive for which see Whitney, §§ 574-576, 737. Patañjali explains that the substitution takes place according to conflict procedure, in fact, according to *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict procedure in which the earlier rule prevails.' For *pūrvavipratiṣedha* see *AP* IV, p. 20-28. According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 306, line 1), *pūrvavipratiṣedha* holds good in the *aṅgādhikāra*. Patañjali further explains that the *jha*-substitution has scope in *lunate, lunatām* and *alunata*, and that, on the other hand, the augment *āṬ* has scope in *patāti vidyut* 'may lightning fall' (ṚgV. 7.15.1) and *udadhiṃ cyāvayāti* 'may he drive away the ocean' (*Taitt. Saṃh.* 3.5.5.2). Both the *jha*-substitution and the augment have scope in *api naḥ vijaniṣyamāṇāḥ patibhiḥ saha śayāntai*, for which see P. 7.1.3, under 3, and 7 (*Vt.* II).

The relevant *prakriyā* is as follows :

(1) *śĪṄ-*		*Dhp.* 2.22
(2) *śī*	+ *lEṬ*	P. 3.4.7
(3) *śī*	+ *jha*	P. 3.4.78

At this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously. They are P. 3.4.94, which prescribes the augment *āṬ*, and P. 7.1.5, which prescribes the substitution of *at* for *jha*. According to P. 1.4.2 in its traditional interpretation, the *para* 'later' rule prevails. In the present case that would lead us to derive the form **śayātai*, whereas we want *śayāntai* which can only be derived by applying the augment rule first. Accordingly, what is meant by *vipratiṣedha* here is *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict procedure in which the earlier rule prevails.' The *prakriyā* then continues :

(4) *śī* + *āṬ* + *jha* P. 3.4.94

Here *jha* is not immediately preceded by an *aṅga* not ending in short *a*. Therefore P. 7.1.5 (*at*) is not applied, because the augment *āṬ* intervenes between *śī* and the personal ending. Instead, P. 7.1.3 is applied. Accordingly, *jh* is replaced by *ant*. The *prakriyā* continues :

(5) *śī* + *ā* + *anta* P. 7.1.3

After the replacement of the final *a* by *e* (P. 3.4.79) and the replacement of *e* by *ai* (P. 3.4.93) the resulting form is *śayāntai*, as desired.

Vt. IV says, or rather not (have recourse to *pūrvavipratiṣedha*) because (the augment) *āṬ* is *nitya* 'invariably applicable.' That is to say, whether or not we first replace *jh* by *at* by P. 7.1.5, still, the augment *āṬ* (P. 3.4.94) can be applied. On the other hand, if we first apply *āṬ*, we cannot replace *jh* by *at*, because *āṬ* intervenes between the verbal base *śī* and the personal ending *jha*. Therefore, out of P. 3.4.94 and P. 7.1.5, the first rule is *nitya* and the latter rule is *anitya*. This being so, the *nitya* rule prevails by *PN*, *pbh*. 42.

Patañjali observes that P. 7.1.5 can be interpreted in two ways. Either the mention of *anaT* 'not ending in short *a*' in P. 7.1.5 qualifies, that is, concerns *jh*, or it concerns a suffix of which *jh* forms part. In the first case, the rule means that *at* replaces *jh* occurring after an *aṅga* not ending in short *a*. This is how *Vt.* IV interprets the rule. In the second case, the rule means that *at* replaces *jh* as part of a suffix occurring after an *aṅga* not ending in short *a*. The difference is that in the second interpretation P. 7.1.5 remains applicable even after the augment *āṬ* has been introduced by P. 3.4.94. The reason is that now *jh* is considered to be part of the suffix *ā* + *jha*, which comes immediately after a verbal base *aṅga* not ending in short *a*. See P. 7.1.3, under 7 (*Vt.* V). Since in this way both of the two rules concerned can be *nitya*, we cannot have recourse to *nityatva* to solve the problem.

Actually, the augment rule is a word-building rule. Word-building rules prevail over substitution rules, except *saṃprasāraṇa* rules which are environment changing rules. See *AP* IV, P. 1.4.99, under 8. Therefore P. 3.4.94 prevails over P. 7.1.5.

Vt. V adds another reason for rejecting *Vt.* III. It says that, also, (we need not bother about *pūrvavipratiṣedha*) because (the augment *āṬ*) prevails over the *at*-substitution by being prescribed by an *antaraṅga* rule. The idea is that, in relation to P. 7.1.5, which prescribes the *at*-substitution, P. 3.4.94 requires less conditions. The *at*-substitution requires both a verbal base *aṅga* not ending in short *a* (*anataḥ aṅgāt*) and the ending *jha*. The augment rule P. 3.4.94 requires only the suffix *lEṬ*. In other words, *āṬ* is *pratyayanimittaka* 'conditioned by a suffix (namely, *lEṬ*),' whereas *at* is *prakṛtipratyayanimittaka* 'conditioned by a stem and a suffix.' Therefore P. 3.4.93 is *antaraṅga* with regard to P. 7.1.5. This being so, P. 3.4.93 prevails by *PN*, *pbh*. 50. The argument is flawed, because rules applicable to a suffix always imply a stem-suffix relation.

Patañjali points out that the *antaraṅgatva* argument holds good, if we accept that the section heading *dhātoḥ* (P. 3.1.91) is valid up to P. 3.4.77, *lasya*. But if we accept that *dhātoḥ* holds good even in the section opened by *lasya*, the consequence is that the *āṬ*-rule and the *at*-rule have the same conditioning elements, namely, a *dhātu* and a *lādeśa*. So there can be no question of one of them being *antaraṅga* in relation to the other. Patañjali then observes that in both cases, whether *dhātoḥ* is continued in the *lasya* section or not, there is no point in having recourse to *pūrvavipratiṣedha*. His solution is to refer to P. 2.4.73. This rule says that in the Vedic language *luk*-deletion of *ŚaP* is variously applied. Sometimes it happens, and sometimes not.

What does Patañjali mean? Let us try to recapitulate the discussion. We have two conflicting examples, *śayāntai* (A) and *śerate* (B). In A the augment *āṬ* intervenes between the verbal base *aṅga śĪ* and the ending *jha*. In B the intervening element is the augment *rUṬ*. But in A we apply P. 7.1.3 which gives us the substitute ending *anta*, whereas in B we apply P. 7.1.5 which gives us the substitute ending *ate*. The complicating factor is that P. 7.1.5 can be interpreted in two ways, as stated above under *Vt.* IV.

Suppose, we interpret P. 7.1.5 as prescribing that *jh* forming part of a suffix is replaced by *at*, if immediately preceded by an *aṅga* not ending in short *a*. In that case, P. 7.1.5 is applicable to both A and B, because the *jh* forms part of the suffixes [*ā* + *jha*] and [*r* + *jha*], and thus follows immediately after *śĪ* which does not end in short *a*. Consequently, we derive the forms *śayātai* and *śerate* of which *śayātai* is not desired. Suppose, on the other hand, that we interpret P. 7.1.5 as prescribing that *jh* is replaced by *at*, if immediately preceded by an *aṅga* not ending in *at*. In that case, in both A and B we cannot replace *jh* by *at* bccause the augments intervene and the condition of immediate sequence is not met. Consequently, we derive the forms *śayāntai* and *śerante*, of which *śerante* is not desired. This is the difficulty.

Patañjali's solution is as follows. We have to keep in mind that *śayāntai* is a Vedic form, and that *śerate* is not. We adopt the first interpretation of P. 7.1.5. In the case of A, in the derivational stage stage *śĪ* + *ŚaP* + [*āṬ* + *jha*], according to the first interpretation of P. 7.1.5, we do not apply the *luk*-deletion of *Śap* by P. 2.4.73, because this rule says *bahulam*. Accordingly, here the *aṅga* [*śĪ* + *a*] ends in short *a*. Now P. 7.1.5 is not applicable, but P. 7.1.3 is. After applying P. 6.1.101 twice we derive the form *śayāntai*, as desired. In the case of B, in the derivational stage *śĪ* + *ŚaP* + [*rUṬ* + *jha*], according to the first interpretation of P. 7.1.5, we do apply the *luk*-deletion of *ŚaP* by P. 2.4.72, because *śĪ* - is a seccond conjugation class

verbal base. Accordingly, here the *aṅga śĪ* does not end in short *a*. Now P. 7.1.5 is applicable, and we derive the form *śerate*, as desired.

What happens, if we adopt the second interpretation of P. 7.1.5, according to which the augment and the following suffix *jha* are separate units? The consequence is that we cannot apply P. 7.1.5 in the case of *śerate*, whether we delete *ŚaP* or not, because the condition of immediate sequence of the *aṅga* and *jha* is not met. The augment *rUṬ* intervenes. The form derived would be **śerante* by P. 7.1.3. That is why, to justify both *śayāntai* and *śerate*, the first interpretation is adopted.

7.1.7 VETTER VIBHĀṢĀ '(the augment *rUṬ* is) preferably not (added to *at* which comes in place of *jh* in initial position of a suffix following immediately after the verbal base *aṅga*) *vid-* "to know"'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing an option for the augment *rUṬ* in connection with *at*, when *at* replaces *jh* after *vid-*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *vetteḥ* (*ataḥ pratyayādeḥ jhaḥ*). Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) as a technical abl. from P. 6.4.1. *Ataḥ* is an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* of *at*, continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.4. *Pratyayādeh* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.2. *Jhah* is a technical gen. (P. 1.1.49) continued from P. 7.1.3. *Vetti* is the quotation form of the verbal base *vid-* 'to know' by *Vt*. II on P. 3.2.108. The *vidheya* is (*rUṬ*) *vibhāṣā* where *rUṬ* is continued from P. 7.1.6. For *vibhāṣā* see Kiparsky 1979, p. 1, and, for a brief discussion of the rule, p. 141-142. In the present context it suspends the *nitya* character of the preceding rules.

3. The *Nyāsa* explains that reference is to *vid-* 'to know' of the second conjugation class (*Dhp*. 2.35) because the quotation form *vetti* shows *luk*-deletion of the *vikaraṇa* by P. 2.4.72.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *saṃvidate* 'they know thoroughly' and *saṃvidrate*; *saṃvidatām* 'they must know thoroughly' and *saṃvidratām*; and *samavidata* 'they knew thoroughly' and *samavidrata*. Here the first form is the preferred form. The *ātm*. ending is added by P. 1.3.29.

5. To point out the significance of the quotation form *vetti*, the *KV* quotes examples from the *rudhādi* verbal base *vid-* (*Dhp*. 7.12), namely, *vinte* 'he finds,' *vindāte* 'the two of them find' and *vindate* 'they find.' The *a* of the *vikaraṇa ŚnaM* (P. 3.1.78) is deleted by P. 6.4.111. In *vinte*, moreover, P. 8.4.56 and 65 are applied

for replacing *d* by *t* and subsequently deleting *t*. Clearly, as far as the present rule is concerned, *vinte*, etc, are redundant.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.8 BAHULAṂ CHANDASI 'in the Veda (the augment *rUṬ* is) variously (added to *at* which comes in place of *jh* in initial position of a suffix following immediately after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which notes that in the Veda there is no fixed rule for inserting *rUṬ* in the position mentioned.

2. The *uddeśya* is provided by the context of the present rule, namely, (*ataḥ pratyayādeḥ jhaḥ*) for which see P. 7.1.7, under 2. The *vidheya* is (*rUṬ*) *bahulaṃ chandasi* where *rUṬ* is continued from P. 7.1.6. The term *bahulam* in *bahulaṃ chandasi* discontinues *vibhāṣā* from P. 7.1.6. For the traditional explanation of *bahulam* see *SA*, n. 519. For *chandas* see *ATA*, n. 131, and *AP* VIII, P. 2.4.28 (b), under 3. For the character of the rule see *AP* IX, P. 6.4.58, under 1.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *devā aduhra / gandharvā apsaraso aduhra* 'the gods milked, the Gandharvas and the apsarasas milked' (*Maitrāyaṇī S.* 4.2.13). The *KV* notes that here *rUṬ* is added given the replacement of *jh* by *at* in the imperfect of *duh-* 'to milk.' In the Veda the deletion of *t* of an *ātm.* finite verb ending takes place by P. 7.1.41. Thus, instead of *aduhata* we find *aduha / aduhra* by applying P. 6.1.97. The *KV* notes that the alternative form *aduhata* without *rUṬ* is also found.

The *KV* explains the point of the word *bahulam* by quoting the example *adṛśram asya ketavaḥ* 'I saw his rays' (ṚgV. 1.50.3). The *KV* explains that in *adṛśram guṇa* by P. 7.4.16 is blocked by the same mention of *bahulam*. See the discussion in conection with P. 7.1.6, under 6 (*Vt.* I).

The *Nyāsa* points out that the form *aduhrata* could be justified on account of the mention of *vibhāṣā* in P. 7.1.7. But by continuing *vibhāṣā* we would have a mere option for adding *rUṬ* to *at* when replacing *jh*. We would not have the possibility of applying *rUṬ* elsewhere. The use of *bahulam* precisely allows this. The *SK*, No. 3557, on P. 7.1.8 quotes the examples *dhenavo duhre* 'the cows give milk,' *ghṛtam aduhre* 'they milked ghee' and *adṛśram asya* 'I saw his / its...'

5. There is a *bhāṣya* on P. 7.1.8-10. Patañjali notes that the expression *bahulaṃ chandasi* is repeated in P. 7.1.10, and that we can do away with one of

the expressions, either the first or the later one. Another grammarian's opinion is also referred to.

7.1.9 ATO BHISA AIS '*ais* (comes) in place of *bhis* after (a nominal base *aṅga* ending in) *aT*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of the inflectional morpheme *bhis* by *ais*, given a nominal stem ending in short *a*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*ataḥ aṅgāt*) *bhisaḥ*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Anataḥ* in P. 7.1.5 is already discontinued by *bahulaṃ chandasi*. *Ataḥ* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. It is interpreted as *adantāt* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). Here *aT* refers to the short vowel *a* (P. 1.1.70). *Bhisaḥ* is the technical sg. gen. of the case ending *bhis* (P. 4.1.2) by P. 1.1.49. *Bhis* has been prescribed after a *prātipadika* (P. 4.1.1). The *vidheya* is *ais*. We note that P. 7.1.9 deals with inflectional morphology and with *sthānyādeśabhāva*.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *vṛkṣaiḥ* 'by means of trees,' *plakṣaiḥ* 'by means of *plakṣa* trees' and *atijarasaiḥ* 'by the exceedingly old ones.' The *KV* provides the meaning-analysis of the latter example and says that after compound-formation (by P. 2.2.18, for *ati*) and vowel-shortening (by P. 1.2.48) the substitution of *ais* for *bhis* takes place. The substitution of *jaras* for *jara* is justified by the maxim *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavati* 'what has undergone change in one part only is not regarded as being different (from the original)' (*PN*, *pbh*. 37). In passing we note that in *atijaras* only the part *jara* is replaced by *jaras*, not *atijaras* as a whole. This is in accordance with *PN*, *pbh*. 12.

According to P. 7.2.101, *jarā* is replaced by *jaras* without preference when a case ending follows which begins with a vowel. Since the rule mentions *jarā*, one might wonder how it could be applied to *jara*. That is why the maxim quoted above is invoked. Thus we derive *atijaras* + *ais*.

Now the question is raised that, since the addition of *ais* is conditioned by the final *a* of *jara*, how can we justify *jaras* which destroys the connection between *aT* and *ais*? Once *jara* has been replaced by *jaras*, the conditioning relation between short *a* in stemfinal position and *ais* is lost. Consequently, *ais* cannot be applied. At this point the *KV* refers to the *sannipātalakṣaṇa-paribhāṣā* (*PN*, *pbh*. 85). According to this *pbh*., a rule conditioned by the connection between two things cannot destroy that relation. Therefore, if this *pbh*. is applied, we cannot apply *jaras*.

Still, we want *jaras*. The way out is to assume that the *pbh*. is *anitya* 'not universally applicable.'

Do we have proof for that? Yes, we have P. 3.1.14. Here the form *kaṣṭāya* is used. It shows the substitution of *ya* for the standard sg. dative ending *e* by P. 7.1.13. It also shows the lengthening of the stemfinal *a*, by P. 7.2.103. But when lengthening has been applied, this destroys the *nimitta* of the *ya*-substitution. Consequently, by the *sannipātalakṣaṇa-pbh*. this substitution cannot be applied. Still, we want *ya*. In order to have *ya*, we must assume that the *sannipātalakṣaṇa-paribhāṣā* is *anitya*.

4. To point out the significance of the word *ataḥ*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *agnibhiḥ* 'by the fires' and *vāyubhiḥ* 'by winds.' These are not stems ending in *a*. To point out the significance of the *anubandha T* in *aT*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *khaṭvābhiḥ* 'by means of cots' and *mālābhih* 'by means of garlands.' These are not stems ending in short *a*.

5. The text of the *KV* as we have it then quotes a *kārikā* from the *bhāṣya* on P. 7.1.9. It reads as follows : *etvaṃ bhisi paratvāc ced ata ais kva bhaviṣyati / krte 'py etve bhautapūrvyād ais tu nityas tathā sati //* 'if the substitution of *e* (for a stem-final *a* is applied) before *bhis* (by P. 7.3.103) because it is the later rule (in relation to P. 7.1.9), then (the question is) where will *ais* (by P. 7.1.9) have scope? Even if the substitution of *e* has been applied (first, still) *ais* (can be applied) on account of its coming earlier (than *e*). This being so, (P. 7.1.9 (becomes) *nitya* 'invariably applicable.'

To explain, at the stage *vṛkṣa + bhis* two rules become applicable simultaneously, namely, P. 7.1.9 (*ais* in place of *bhis*) and P. 7.3.103 (*e* in place of the stem final *a*). This is a two-way conflict in the sense that whichever rule we apply first, the other rule will be debarred. The point is that P. 7.3.103 is conditioned by a suffix beginning with a *jhaL* sound (any consonant except a nasal). Once *bhis* has been replaced by *ais*, there is no *jhaL* sound any more. Now, to solve this conflict, suppose we invoke P. 1.4.2, as is done by tradition. Accordingly, P. 7.3.103 will prevail over P. 7.1.9. The form derived will be *vṛkṣebhiḥ*, instead of *vṛkṣaiḥ*. The consequence is that now the substitution of *ais* is left without scope of application. In other words, P. 7.1.9 will be *anavakāśa*. Being *anavakāśa*, it must prevail. That seems to clinch the matter.

In the second line, first *pāda*, of the *Ślokavārttika* another solution is offered. The argument turns on what is called *bhūtapūrvagati* 'the understanding of some-

thing that was there in an earlier stage.' Reference is to what has become *PN, pbh.* 61. The something meant here is the stem final *a*, like in *vṛkṣa* + *bhis*. We will now assume that even after the application of P. 7.3.103 (*vṛkṣe* + *bhis*) that stem-final *a* is still there. Therefore P. 7.1.9 can be applied. But, as stated in the second line, second *pāda*, this amounts to assuming that P. 7.1.9 has the character of a *nitya* rule which is to be applied irrespective of any other rule.

Having recourse to the *para*-principle here is a traditional misunderstanding. Also, invoking the *bhūtapūrvagati* does not work. *Bhūtapūrvagati* is resorted to only if we cannot show any example without such an assumption. But P. 7.3.103 has examples where P. 7.1.9 is not applicable, like *vṛkṣebhyaḥ* and *vṛkṣeṣu*. The correct solution is that P. 7.1.9 by specifically mentioning *bhis*, becomes an *apavāda* to P. 7.3.101, which is the more general rule. since apart from *bhis*, it is is also applicable before *bhyas* and *su*. See *AP* IV, p. 19, for the *utsarga-apavāda* principle. Being an *apavāda*, P. 7.1.9 prevails.

6. The *KV* finally points out that *ataḥ* forms a section heading valid up to P. 7.1.17.

7. For the *bhāṣya* see P. 7.1.8, under 5.

7.1.10 BAHULAṂ CHANDASI 'in the Vedic language (*ais* is) variously (substituted for *bhis* coming immediately after a nominal base *aṅga* ending in *aT*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* which notes that in the Veda there is no fixed rule for the substitution of *ais* for *bhis*. Compare Whitney, § 309 d.

2. The *uddeśya* is provided by the context, namely, (*ataḥ aṅgāt bhisaḥ*), for which see P. 7.1.9, under 2. The *vidheya* is (*ais*) *bahulaṃ chandasi*. For *bahulaṃ chandasi* see P. 7.1.8, under 2. The *KV* explains *bahulam* by saying that in the Vedic language *ais* is added after a nominal stem ending in short *a*, or not ending in short *a*. Or even *bhis* may not be replaced at all, like in *devebhiḥ*.

The *Nyāsa* observes that the mention of *bahulam* is redundant because we could have it by *maṇḍūkapluti* from P. 7.1.8.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are (for stems not ending in short *a*) *nadyaiḥ* 'by means of rivers' and (for stems ending in short *a*) *devebhiḥ sarvebhiḥ proktam* 'promulgated by all gods.'

4. For the *bhāṣya* see P. 7.1.8, under 5.

7.1.11 NEDAMADASOR AKOḤ '(*ais* is) not (substituted for *bhis*) after (the pronominal base *aṅgas*) *idam* "this" and *adas* "that," except when containing *k*'

1. This is a *pratiṣedhasūtra* which prohibits the addition of the case morpheme *ais* in the instances noted.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*bhisaḥ aṅgayoḥ*) *idamadasoḥ akoḥ*. *Bhisaḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.9. *Aṅgayoḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Idamadasoḥ* is a technical du. abl. of two pronominal stems by P. 1.1.67. For the ending *os* see *AP* III, p. 21 and 134. *Akoḥ*, which is a *bv.* cp. also used in P. 6.1.132, qualifies *idamadasoḥ*. Reference by *k* is to the *taddhita* suffix *akaC* by P. 5.3.71. The *vidheya* is (*ais*) *na* in which *ais* is continued from P. 7.1.9. *Na* discontinues *bahulaṃ chandasi*. We note that the rule contains two negations.

What about *atah* from P. 7.1.9, continued in P. 7.1.10? There is no harm in continuing *ataḥ* (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) in the present rule because even after the insertion of *akaC* the forms derived do end in short *a*.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *ebhiḥ* 'by means of these' and *amībhiḥ* 'by means of those.' As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the *m* of *idam* is replaced by *a* by P. 7.2.102, after which P. 6.1.97 is applied. That gives us *ida*. Here *id* is deleted before *bhis* by P. 7.2.113. Then the remaining *a* is replaced by P. 7.3.103.

4. To point out the significance of *akoh*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *imakaiḥ* 'by means of these' and *amukaiḥ* 'by means of those.' As explained by the *Nyāsa*, here the *taddhita* suffix *akaC* is added by P. 5.3.71. The *d* of *idam* is replaced by *m* by P. 7.2.109, and *ekādeśa* is applied by P. 6.1.97. In *amuka* the *d* of *adas* is replaced by *m* whereas *u* replaces the following vowel *a* by P. 8.2.80.

5. According to the *KV*, the negative condition *akoḥ* gives us a clue which is phrased as *tanmadhyapatitas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate* '(in grammar) by the mention of x that which has been inserted in x is included' (*PN*, *pbh*. 89). Thereby *imaka* and *amuka* are covered by rules mentioning *idam* and *adas*.

6. The *KV*, referring to Patañjali's *bhāṣya*, notes that the rule does not say *idamadasoḥ kāt* 'after *k* of (i.e., inserted in) *idam* and *adas* (*bhis* is replaced by *ais*).' The point intended by the *KV* is explained by the *Nyāsa* as follows. If this had been the phrasing, then, since we could have managed by P. 7.1.9, the present rule would

serve for restriction. The formulation of a restriction depends on the place assigned to the word *eva*. If *eva* is put after *kāt*, we obtain the sense that the *ais*-substitution is to take place after that *k* only which comes after *bhis* added to *idam* and *adas*,that is, when *idam* and *adas* contain *k*. Understood in this way, the restriction enables us to account for everything, and we can phrase P. 7.1.11 in a more economical way. But in that case it cannot serve to offer us a clue. Dimwits might argue even the opposite restriction, namely, by putting *eva* after *idamadasoḥ*, as in *idamadasor eva kāt*. That is to say, *ais* replaces *bhis* which follows after the *k* which is inserted in *idam* and *adas* only. In that case, we cannot justify forms like *sarvakaiḥ* and *viśvakaiḥ*. So to phrase the restriction in this way leads to difficulties, we better keep the rule as it is, namely, stating *na...akoḥ*. As the *KV* says, the negative formulation of P. 7.1.11 serves to prevent the the opposite restriction.

7. The *KV* points out that in *ebhiḥ* and *amībhiḥ* there is no *ais*-substitution at all.

8. In the derivation of *imakaiḥ*, at the stage *ida* + *bhis*, one may wonder why P. 7.2.113, which prescribes *lopa* of *id* before a suffix beginning with a consonant, is not applied. The answer is that P. 7.1.11 changes the environment in which P. 7.2.113 is to be applied. Therefore, according to the *siddha*-principle, P. 7.1.11 prevails over P. 7.2.113. For this principle see *AP* I, p. 85-90, and earlier P. Kiparsky, "What is *siddha*?", *ABORI*, Vol. LXVIII. Poona 1987, p. 294-303.

9. We have no *Vt*. on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali notes that P. 7.1.11 states two prohibitions, *na* and *akoḥ*, and that both can be dispensed with by stating *idamadasoḥ kāt*. The rephrased rule has the character of a *niyama* 'restrictive rule' in the sense that *ais* is substituted for *bhis* in connection with *idam* and *adas* only when they contain *k*. The flaw in Patañjali's proposal has been pointed out by the *KV*.

7.1.12 ṬĀṄASIṄASĀM INĀTSYĀḤ *'ina, āt and sya* are the substitutes of *Ṭā*, *ṄasI*, and *Ṅas* respectively (after a nominal base *anga* ending in *aT*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing substitutes for three inflectional morphemes.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*ataḥ aṅgāt*) *ṭāṅasīṅasām*. Here *ataḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.9. *Angāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ṭā*, *ṄasI* and *Ṅas* are inflectional suffixes (sg. instr., abl. and gen.) prescribed by P. 1.4.2. Given the exact correspondence between the elements to be substituted and the substitutes,

P. 1.3.10 is applied to esrtablish a one-to-one correspondence. The *vidheya* is *inātsyāḥ*. The negation *na* from P. 7.1.11 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. See *FANU*, p. 274, convention 39. It makes no sense to continue *na* in the present rule.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *Ṭā* :

vṛkṣeṇa 'by means of a tree' and *plakṣeṇa* 'by means of a *plakṣa* tree'

(2) For *ṄasI* :

vṛkṣāt 'from a tree' and *plakṣāt* 'from a *plakṣa* tree'

(3) For *Ṅas* :

vṛkṣasya 'of a tree' and *plakṣasya* 'of a *plakṣa* tree'

4. To point out the significance of the word *ataḥ* continued in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *sakhyā* 'by means of a friend' and *patyā* 'by means of the husband.' For the declension of *sakhi* see *AP* IV, P. 1.4.7, under 7. For *pati* in the sense of 'husband' see *AP* IV, P. 1.4.8, under 4.

5. The *KV* then refers to the opinion of some grammarians who hold that *atijarasina* 'by an extremely old one' and *atijarasāt* 'from an extremely old one' are correct forms of the sg. inst. and abl. respectively of *atijaras*. But these forms are not found in the *Mbh*. Therefore, the *KV* says, it is understood that they are not desired.

As indicated by the *Padamañjarī*, the derivation of *atijarasina* is as follows :

(1) *ati + jara*		shortening of the final stemvowel in *jarā* by P. 1.2.48 and cp.-formation by *Saunāgavārttika* F6. See *TA*, p. 194; compare *atikhaṭva*.
(2) *atijara*	+ *Ṭā*	P. 4.1.2
(3) *atijara*	+ *ina*	P. 7.1.12
(4) *atijaras*	+ *ina*	P. 7.2.101
atijarasina.		

In stage 4 the substitution of *jaras* for *jara* can be justified because the *sannipātalakṣaṇaparibhāṣā* is not invariably applicable. Otherwise, if the *pbh.* had been invariably applicable, it would have prohibited this substitution. The point is that suffix *ina* requires a stem ending in short *a*. This condition is destroyed precisely by the substitution of *jaras* for *jara*. In fact, we better not assume the *sannipātalakṣaṇaparibhāṣā* at all, because it has numerous counterexamples.

In stage (2) two rules become applicable at the same time. They are P. 7.1.12 (*Ṭā* replaced by *ina*) and P. 7.2.101 (*jara* replaced by *jaras*). Thus we have a conflict. The *jarasina* grammarians referred to by the *KV* must have assumed that P. 7.1.12 prevails over P. 7.2.101 by *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'a conflict in which the earlier rule prevails.' According to Patañjali (*Mbh.* I, p. 360, line 1), *pūrvavipratiṣedha* holds good in the *aṅgādhikāra*.

The derivation of *atijarasāt* follows the same lines :

(1) *atijara* + *Ṅasl*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *atijara* + *āt*	P. 7.1.12
(3) *atijaras* + *āt*	P. 7.2.101
atijarasāt.	

Again, the non-application of the *sannipātalakṣaṇaparibhāṣā* and the application of *pūrvavipratiṣedha* is assumed.

What about applying the *siddha*-principle in the derivations stated? In both cases P. 7.2.101 figures as the environment changing rule. It destroys the *nimitta* of applying *ina* and āt. Therefore, by the *siddha*-principle *jaras* is to be applied first. Consequently, the resulting forms are *atijarasā* and *atijarasaḥ*, which happen to be the correct forms. See P. 7.1.9, under 3, for the derivation of *atijaras* + *ais*. The application of the *siddha*-principle also does away with the misconception of *pūrvavipratiṣedha*.

6. We have no *Vt.* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali discusses the question why *ina* has been prescribed as a substitute, and not *na*. If *na* had been prescribed, we could have *etva* 'the substitution of *e*' for the stemfinal *a* by dividing P. 7.3.105 into (a) *āṅi ca* and (b) *āpaḥ*. Here the (a) rule is interpreted to mean that before the sg. instr. suffix (stated as *āṄ*) the stemfinal short *a* is replaced by *e*. Then Patañjali points out several difficulties which are removed by tricky arguments not useful in interpreting the A.

7.1.13 ṄER YAḤ '*ya* (comes) in place of *Ṅe* (after a nominal base *aṅga* ending in *aT*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing *ya* as the substitute of the sg. dat. ending *Ṅe* after a *prātipadika* ending in short *a*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ṅeḥ* (*ataḥ aṅgāt*). *Ṅe* is the sg. dat. case ending prescribed by P. 4.1.2. The form *ṅeḥ*, which is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49, is derived by P. 6.1.110. Thus from *Ṅe* + *as* we derive *Ṅes*. We note in passing that *ṅeḥ* in P. 7.3.116 is derived from *Ṅi* (the sg. locative ending) + *as* by P. 7.3.111 and 6.1.110 again. *Ṅeḥ* discontinues *ṭāṅasiṅasām* from P. 7.1.12. *Ataḥ*, i.e. *adantāt*, is continued from P. 7.1.9, and *aṅgāt* (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. The *aṅga* must be a nominal stem *aṅga*, because *Ṅe* has been prescribed after a *prātipadika* (P. 4.1.1). The *vidheya* is *yaḥ*. It discontinues *inātsyāḥ* from P. 7.1.12.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *vṛkṣāya* 'to the tree' and *plakṣāya* 'to the *Plakṣa* tree.' Lengthening of the vowel in stemfinal position is by P. 7.3.102.

4. To point out the significance of the word *ataḥ*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *sakhye* 'to a friend' and *patye* 'to the husband.' Compare P. 7.4.12, under 4.

5. Finally, the *KV* refers to the fact that the *sannipātalakṣaṇaparibhāṣā* (*PN*, *pbh*. 85) is *anitya*, in order to justify the substitution prescribed by P. 7.1.13. Compare P. 7.1.9, under 3. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the vowel lengthening destroys the *nimitta* of the *ya*-substitution. Therefore, by the *pbh*. referred to the substitution by P. 7.1.13 would not be applied. But on the assumption that the *pbh*. is not invariably applicable the substitution is still applied.

6. We have no *Vt*. on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali raises the question whether *ṇeh* refers to the sg. dative case ending, or rather to the sg. locative ending. See under 2, above. The question is decided by invoking *PN*, *pbh*.1. We can decide the issue on the basis of interpretation.

7.1.14 SARVANĀMNAḤ SMAI '*smai* (comes in place of *Ṅe*) after a pronominal base *aṅga* (ending in short *a*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing *smai* as the substitute of the sg. dat. ending *Ṅe* in the case of a pronoun.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*ṅeḥ ataḥ*) *sarvanāmnaḥ* (*aṅgāt*). Here *ṅeḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.13, and *ataḥ* from P. 7.1.9. The designation *sarvanāman* is defined by P. 1.1.27 by enumeration as applying to *sarva*, etc. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. The *vidheya* is *smai*. It discontinues *yaḥ* from P. 7.1.13.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *sarvasmai* 'to all,' *viśvasmai* 'to all,' *yasmai* 'to him who,' *kasmai* 'to whom?' and *tasmai* 'to him.'

4. The *KV* then refers to *Vts*. I and II on the rule for which see below.

5. We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that because of single substitution in the case of *aŚ* inclusion is to be made of *smai*, etc. Reference is to P. 2.4.32. This rule says that *aŚ* is substituted for *idam* when a case ending from the instrumental case ending onwards follows, and when the question is of subsequent reference by the pronoun. The difficulty concerns *ekādeśa* 'single substitution' by P. 6.1.101.

The examples quoted by Patañjali are *atrāsmai* 'here to this,' *atrāsmāt* 'here from this' and *atrāsmin* 'here in / on this.' We will confine ourselves to the first example. The technical rendering (*vākyasaṃskārapakṣa*, see *VIBHA*, Introduction, p. i-ii) is *atra* + *idam* + *Ṅe*. Here it is assumed that *idam* is anaphorically used. Therefore it is replaced by *aŚ* as a whole (P. 1.1.55). That gives us the stage *atra* + *aŚ* + *e*. Now, if we apply P. 6.1.101, the result is *atrā* + *e*. Here *atrā* does not end in short *a*, so we cannot apply P. 7.1.14. That is why *Vt*. I reasons that we have to make an additional statement to provide for *smai* still to be added.

Vt. II rejects *Vt*. I by saying *na vā bahiraṅgalakṣaṇatvāt* 'or rather not, because (the single substitution) is dependent on an outside cause.' Reference is to what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 50. The argument is that P. 6.1.101 is *bahiraṅga* with reference to P. 7.1.14, because it applies across the *pada* boundary, namely, to the *a* of *atra* and to the *a* (of *aŚ*) which has replaced *idam*. On the other hand, P. 7.1.14 requires one *pada* only for its application, namely, *a* + *Ṅe*. Therefore P. 7.1.14 is *antaraṅga* with regard to P. 6.1.101. Being *antaraṅga* it prevails by the *pbh*. mentioned. Thus we derive *atra* + *asmai*, and subsequently *atrāsmai*. No special rule to justify this form is needed.

Na vā bahiraṅgalakṣaṇatvāt is a standard *Vt*. used 17 times by the *Vārttikakāra*, as follows : *Vt*. VII on P. 1.1.47; IX on P. 3.1.3; II on P. 3.4.89; V on P. 6.1.63; II on P. 6.1.71; XXIII on P. 6.1.85; II on P. 6.1.87; III on P. 6.1.91; IV on P. 6.1.93;

II on P. 6.1.113; V on P. 6.1.125; II on P. 6.1.205; II on P. 6.2.29; II on P. 7.1.14; V on P. 8.2.42; II on P. 8.3.15; III on P. 8.3.41.

7.1.15 ṄASIṄYOḤ SMĀTSMINAU '*smāt* and *smin* (come) in place of *ṄasI* and *Ṅi* respectively (after a pronominal base *aṅga* ending in short *a*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra*, prescribing substitutes of two inflectional morphemes.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*ataḥ sarvanāmnaḥ aṅgāt*) *ṅasiṅyoḥ*. Here *ataḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.9, *sarvanāmnaḥ* from P. 7.1.14 and *aṅgāt*) with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *ṄasI* and *Ṅi* are the case endings for the sg. abl. and loc. prescribed by P. 4.1.2. *Ṅasiṅyoḥ* is a technical gen. (P. 1.1.49). It discontinues *ṅeḥ* from P. 7.1.13 continued in P. 7.1.14. Given the exact correspondence between the elements to be substituted and the substitutes P. 1.3.10 is applied to establish a one-to-one correspondence. The *vidheya* is *smātsminau*. It discontinues *smai* from P. 7.1.14.

3. The examples quotes by the *KV* are

(1) For *smāt* :

sarvasmāt 'from all, *viśvasmāt* 'from all,' *yasmāt* 'from him who,' *tasmāt* 'from him' and *kasmāt* 'from whom?'

(2) For *smin* :

sarvasmin 'in all,' *viśvasmin* 'in all,' *yasmin* 'in him who' *tasmin* 'in him' and *anyasmin* 'in somebody else'

4. To point out the significance of *ataḥ* continued in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *bhavataḥ* 'from you, sir' and *bhavati* 'in you, sir.' The stem *bhavat* does not end in short *a*.

To point out the significance of the word *sarvanāmnaḥ* continued in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *vṛkṣāt* (P. 7.1.12) and *vṛkṣe* (P. 6.1.87), which are self-explanatory.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.16 PŪRVĀDIBHYO NAVABHYO VĀ '(*smāt* and *smin*) preferably (come in place of *Ṅasī* and *Ṅi* respectively) after the nine (pronominal base *aṅgas*) beginning with *pūrva* "earlier" (ending in short *a*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the preferred substitution of two inflectional morphemes in the case of nine specified stems. Thereby the preferred forms show a pronominal inflection, whereas the non-preferred forms follow a nominal declension.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*adbhyaḥ sarvanāmabhyaḥ*) *pūrvādibhyaḥ navabhyaḥ* (*aṅgebhyaḥ ṅasiṅyoḥ*). Here *adbhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.9, *ataḥ*, and interpreted as *adantebhyaḥ* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Sarvanāmabhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.14, *sarvanāmnaḥ*.

Pūrvādi is a *gaṇa* consisting of nine items, as the *sūtra* itself says. *Nava* refers to the nine stems mentioned in P. 1.1.34-36. *Pūrvādi* has not been mentioned as a separate *gaṇa* in the *gaṇapāṭha*, but in Böhtlingk's edition of the *gaṇapātha* (no. 241) P. 1.1.34-36 have been included under a subgroep of *sarvādi*. For a discussion see Kiparsky 1979, p. 83-85, and *AP* I, P. 1.1.36, under 4. The rules P. 1.1.34-36 do not originally belong to the *gaṇapāṭha*, but to the *sūtrapāṭha*. This is clearly indicated by the *KV* on P. 1.1.36 which mentions *antare* as a counterexample for P. 1.1.36. *Aṅgebhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1.

Ṅasiṅyoḥ is continued from P. 7.1.15. For the one-to-one correspondence with *smātsminau* P. 1.3.10 is applied. The *vidheya* is *vā* (*smātsminau*). For *vā* see Kiparsky 1979, p. 1. *Smātsminau* is continued from P. 7.1.15.

3. A complete enumeration of the items listed in the *pūrvādi-gaṇa* is provided by the *KV* together with the alternative forms for the two case formations. The non-preferred forms show *āt* for the sg. abl. ending (P. 7.1.12) and *e* for the sg. loc. ending (P. 6.1.87).

4. To point out the significance of the word *navabhyaḥ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *tyasmāt* 'from that' and *tyasmin* 'in that.' They are case forms of the pronominal stem *tyad* which has been listed in the *tyadādi-gaṇa* (P. 1.1.74), which comes under the *sarvādi-gaṇa* (Böhtlingk's edition, no. 241).

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.17 JASAḤ ŚĪ '*ŚĪ* (comes) in place of *Jas* (after a pronominal base *aṅga* ending in short *a*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the invariable substitution of *ŚĪ* for the pl. nom. case ending after specified pronominal stems.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*ataḥ sarvanāmnaḥ aṅgāt*) *jasaḥ*. Here *ataḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.9, *sarvanāmnaḥ* from P. 7.1.14, and *aṅgāt* (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ataḥ* is interpreted as *adantāt* by the *tadantavidhi*, P. 1.1.72. *Ataḥ, sarvanāmnaḥ* and *aṅgāt* are technical ablatives by P. 1.1.67. *Jasaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Jas* is the pl. nom. ending prescribed by P. 4.1.2. The *vidheya* is *ŚĪ*. Since *ŚĪ* is *Śit*, it replaces the whole of the *sthānin Jas* by P.1.1.55.

The *Nyāsa* notes that, if *Ś* had not been added, only the *a* of *Jas* would have been substituted, by P. 1.1.54. The option word *vā* from P. 7.1.16 is cancelled because P. 7.1.17 introduces a new *vidheya*. See *FANU*, p. 272, convention 24.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *sarve* 'all,' *viśve* 'all,' *ye* 'those who,' *ke* 'who?' and *te* 'they / those,' all of them masc. pl. nom. forms.

In the case of *ye* and *te*, the *d* of *yad* and *tad* is replaced by *a* by P. 7.2.102. Then *ekādeśa* of *a + a* is applied by P. 6.1.97. That gives us the pronominal stems *ta* and *ya*. In the case of *ke*, the pronominal stem *ka* comes as the substitute of *kim* by P. 7.2.103.

4. Why the long *Ī* in *ŚĪ*, when short *i* would do also? The *KV* notes that the mention of long *Ī* is for the sake of the following rules, like in the formation of *trapuṇī* 'the two objects of tin' and *jatunī* 'the two objects with lac.'

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

Excursus on inflectional and non-inflectional morphology in the A.

Within morphology we make a distinction between inflectional (*suP, tiṄ*) and non-inflectional (*kṛt, taddhita* stem-formation) morphology. Here two different approaches are seen in the A. Pāṇini's treatment of non-inflectional morphology is characterized by positing a basic, general morpheme (suffix) and listing special suffixes conditioned by specified environments by way of *apavāda*. But his treatment of inflectional morphology is characterized by substitution implying inheritance of distinctive, non-phonological features (*sthānivadbhāva*, P. 1.1.56). For in-

stance, the *kṛt* suffix *aṆ*, conveying the general grammatical sense of *kartṛ* (P. 3.4.68) is introduced by P. 3.2.1 as the basic, general suffix. The suffix *Ka* (P. 3.2.3-7) is a special suffix the addition of which is conditioned by different environments. So also *ṬaK*, *aC* and *Ṭa* (P. 3.2.8, 9 and 16), etc. Between these suffixes no *sthānyādeśabhāva* holds. One suffix is not the substitute of the other, but the special suffix overrules the general suffix by way of *apavāda*, implying *bādhyabādhakabhāva*.

The same practice is followed in the *taddhita* section. For instance, the *taddhita* suffix *aṆ* is prescribed as a basic, general suffix by P. 4.1.92 in the section up to P. 4.4.2. The suffixes introduced later on in this section are all of them special suffixes whose addition is conditioned by different environments. Between these suffixes no *sthānyādeśabhāva* holds.

In the case of inflectional morphemes (*suP*, *tiṄ*) Pāṇini's approach is different. A list of basic case suffixes is introduced by P. 4.1.2, and a list of basic finite verb endings by P. 3.4.78. All of these endings may be replaced by others. For instance, the case suffix *bhis* is replaced by *ais*, by P. 7.1.9. Compare also P. 7.1.12-15 for other substitutions. Thus, instead of treating *ais* and *ŚI* as exceptions to the basic endings *bhis* and *Jas*, Pāṇini treats them as substitutes of *bhis* and *Jas*. For the finite verb endings (headed by *lasya*, P. 3.4.77, a technical gen. by P. 1.1.67) compare P. 3.4.79-101. The tense and mood verb endings are treated as substitutes of *tiṄ* as the comprehensive term for the basic verb endings.

Inflectional and non-inflectional morphemes are introduced in the section P. 3.1.1-5.4.160. Morphophonology, that is, rules dealing with substitutions under morphological conditions, is taught in the *aṅgādhikāra* (P. 6.4.1 - 7.4.97). The basic substitution rule applied in the latter section is P. 1.1.56. By this rule the substitutes of *suP* or *tiṄ* are treated like the originals. This device, known as *sthānyādeśabhāva*, is meant for *lāghava* 'economy of statement.' It relieves Pāṇini of endless repetitions of statements regarding inheritance of properties by the *ādeśa*.

As regards inflectional morphology, *sthānyādeśabhāva* holds good for single morphemes only, not for sequences of morphemes. For instance, the sequence *ŚaP* + *ti* (P. 3.1.68) as a whole is never replaced by *yaK* + *te* (P. 3.1.67). What has been prescribed here is the substitution of single morphemes for single morphemes. So also in the aorist sequence *ClI* + *lUṄ* (P. 3.1.44). Here the sequence as a whole is not replaced by *s* + *t* as a whole.

Apart from inflectional morphology, substitution is also applied in three other instances. They are verbal base substitutions, phoneme substitutions which

come under the heading *saṃhitāyām*, and *pada* substitutions by means of enclitic forms. We refer to the section P. 2.4.36-57, to the sections P. 6.1.77-134 and P. 8.2.1-8.4.68, and to P. 8.1.20-23. In the case of phoneme substitutions inheritance of properties is not allowed by *analvidhau* in P. 1.1.56. The *pada* substitutions referred to do not come under morphology, but under sentence formation (P. 8.1.16-17, *padasya padāt*).

End of Excursus

To return to P. 7.1.18, *ŚĪ* is the substitute of *Jas*. Being a substitute, non-phonological properties of *Jas* like *suptva* 'being a case ending,' *bahuvacanatva* 'being a plural suffix' and *prathamātva* 'being a nom. case ending' are transferred from *Jas* to *ŚĪ*.

7.1.18 AUṄA ĀPAḤ '(*ŚĪ* comes) in place of *auṄ* (after a nominal base *aṅga*) ending in *āP*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the invariable substitution of *ŚĪ* for the nom. and acc. dual endings after stems ending in a fem. suffix.

2. The *uddeśya* is *āpaḥ auṅaḥ*. Here *āP* is the comprehensive term for the fem. suffixes *ṬāP*, etc. (P. 4.1.4, 13, 74). It is interpreted as *ābantāt* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). It discontinues both *ataḥ* from P. 7.1.9 and *sarvanāmnaḥ* from P. 7.1.14. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. For *auṄ* see under 4, below. *Auṅaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. The *vidheya* is (*ŚĪ*), continued from P. 7.1.17.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *khaṭve tiṣṭhataḥ* 'the two cots are there,' *khaṭve paśya* 'look at the two cots,' *bahurāje* 'two fem. beings possessing many kings' (du. nom. / acc. fem.), and *kārīṣagandhye* 'two female descendants of Karīṣa-gandhi,' lit. 'one having a smell like that of dung.'

The derivation of *bahurāje* starting from *bahurājan* as a *bv*. cp. is as follows :

(1) *bahurājan*	+ *ḌāP*		P. 4.1.13
(2) *bahurāj*°°	+ *ā*		P. 6.4.143
(3) *bahurāj*	+ *ā*	+ *au*	P. 4.1.2 (du. nom. / acc.)
(4) *bahurāj*	+ *ā*	+ *ŚĪ*	P. 7.1.18
(5) *bahurāj*	+	*e*	P. 6.1.87
bahurāje.			

The derivation of *kārīṣagandhye* starting from *karīṣagandha* as an *upamāna-pūrvapada bv.* cp. is as follows :

(1)	*karīsagandhi*	P. 5.4.137
(2)	*gandhi* + *aṆ*	P. 4.1.92
(3)	*kārisagandhi* + *a*	P. 7.2.117
(4)	*gandh°* + *a*	P. 6.4.148
(5)	*gandh* + *ṢyaṄ*	P. 4.1.78
(6)	*gandh* + *ya* + *CāP*	P. 4.1.74
(7)	*gandh* + *yā*	P. 6.1.101
(8)	*gandh* + *yā* + *au*	P. 4.1.2
(9)	*gandh* + *yā* + *ŚI*	P. 7.1.18
(10)	*gandh* + *ye*	P. 6.1.87
	karīṣagandhye.	

4. The *KV* says that the *Ṅ* of *auṄ* is added to have a general designation, so that *auṬ*, the du. acc. ending (P. 4.1.2), is also included. Phrasing the rule as *au āpaḥ* (*au* as an *avibhaktikanirdeśa*) is no help, because by *PN*, *pbh*. 81, that would not include the du. acc. ending *auṬ*.

5. Then the *KV* quotes two *kārikās* from the *Mbh.* on P. 7.1.18 , as follows :

aukāro 'yaṃ śīvidhau ṅid gṛhīto ṅiccāsmākaṃ nāsti ko 'yaṃ prakāraḥ /
sāmānyārthas tasya cāsañjane 'smin ṅitkāryam te śyāṃ prasaktaṃ sa doṣaḥ //
ṅittve vidyād varṇanirdeśamātraṃ varṇe yat syāt tac ca vidyāt tadādau /
varṇaś cāyaṃ tena ṅittve 'py adoṣaḥ nirdeśo 'yaṃ pūrvasūtreṇa vā syāt //

(Objection) 'This *au* has been provided with *Ṅ* in the rule about *ŚI*. But (*au* being) *Ṅit* does not exist (in grammar) to our (the Pāṇinian grammarians') opinion. What funny kind (of formulating a *sūtra)* is this? (If) the addition of this (*Ṅ*) is meant to have a general term (for *au* and *auṬ*), (then) to your opinion a *Ṅit*-operation has a chance to apply with regard to *ŚI*, (and) that is a mistake.'

(Answer) (i) 'As regards *Ṅittva*, one may understand that (*Ṅ* in *ṅiti* in P. 7.3.113, continued from P. 7.3.111) is only the mention of a speechsound. (ii) When a speechsound (is referred to in the A), one should understand that it refers to what begins with that (sound). (iii) (Or) this (*Ṅ*) is (just) a speechsound (and not an *anubandha*), therefore, even if (*auṄ*) is provided with *Ṅ*, there is no harm. (iv) Or this mention may be according to a previous (prepāṇinian) *sūtra*.'

The answer really consists of four answers phrased in a lapidary way, summarizing the discussion in the preceding *bhāṣya*. See further under 6.

6. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. In the Kielhorn ed. of the *Mbh.* the order of the *bhāṣyas* on P. 7.1.18 and P. 7.1.20 has been reversed. In the *bhāṣya* on P. 7.1.18 Patañjali raises the question about the purpose of the *Ṅ-anubandha* in *auṄ*. Four different answers are provided. We have to keep in mind that, according to P. 7.3.113, *yāṭ āpaḥ*, the augment *yāṬ* is inserted before a case ending marked by *Ṅ* after a nominal stem *aṅga* ending in a fem. suffix. In P. 7.3.113 the locative term *ṅiti* is continued from P.7.3.111. E.g., from *mālā* + *Ṅe* we derive *mālā* + *yā* + *e*, and finally *mālāyai* by P. 6.1.88. The derivation of the du. nom./acc. is *mālā* + *auṄ* → *mālā* + *ŚĪ* → *māle* by P. 6.1.87. Since the *Ṅ* of *auṄ* has no *Ṅit*-function, *yā* is not inserted.

The anwers stated by Patañjali are as follows :

(i) The addition of *Ṅ* in *auṄ* is meant to include both *au* and *auṬ*. Stating *auṬ* will not do, because that would refer to the du. acc. only. Simply stating *au* will not do either because that would rule out *auṬ*.

(ii) The objection says that *auṄ* taken as a *Ṅit* suffix might trigger off the application of P. 7.3.113 which is not desired. But that can be prevented by interpreting *Ṅiti* in this rule not as a *bv.* cp. in the sense of *Ṅ id asya* 'that which contains *Ṅ* as an *it*-letter,' but as a *kdh.* cp. in the sense of *Ṅ eva it* 'the *it*-letter which is *Ṅ* itself.' Compare the *Padamañjarī* which says *karmadhārayah - ṅaś cāsāv ic ca*. Thereby *Ṅit* stands for the single *it*-letter *Ṅ*. Referring to a single *it*-letter, the term *Nit* becomes an *algrahaṇa* 'mention of a speechsound.' Wherever a speechsound (*varṇa*) is mentioned in the A. in the loc., it is interpreted to refer to an element which begins with that sound (*PN*, *pbh.* 33; *Vt.* XXIX on P. 1.1.72). Thus *ṅiti* continued in P. 7.3.113 must be interpreted to mean 'before a case ending which begins with *Ṅ*.' But, so the argument goes, *auṄ* does not begin with *Ṅ*. Therefore the difficulty raised about P. 7.3.113 becoming applicable does not arise. The argument is far-fetched, because *Ṅit* is never a *kdh.* cp.

(iii) *Ṅ* is simply a *varṇa* 'speechsound,' and not an *anubandha* meant for *Ṅit*-operations like the insertion of *yā* by P. 7.3.113.

(iv) *AuṄ* is a prepāṇinian term. Therefore the *Ṅ* cannot be connected with *anubandha*-operations in the A. Compare *āṄ* used in P. 7.3.105. The *KV* on this rule

says *āṅiti pūrvācāryanirdeśena tṛtīyaikavacanaṃ gṛhyate*. Answer (iv) is the finally accepted answer.

7.1.19 NAPUṂSAKĀC CA 'also (*ŚĪ* comes in place of *auṄ*) after a neuter (nominal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *ŚĪ* for the du. nom./acc. endings of any neuter nominal stem.

2. The *uddeśya* is *napuṃsakāt* (*aṅgāt auṅaḥ*). *Napuṃsakāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. It discontinues *āpaḥ* from P. 7.1.18, because *āpaḥ* and *napuṃsakāt* are mutually contradictory. *Napuṃsaka* is a pre-pāṇinian term borrowed from *prātiśākhya* literature and traditionally defined as what is not masculine nor feminine. See further *AP* I, P. 1.1.43, under 4. The term *aṅgāt* is continued from P. 6.4.1 and *auṅaḥ* from P. 7.1.18. The *vidheya* is (*ŚĪ*) continued from P. 7.1.17.

The particle *ca* marks the rule boundary with the preceding rule. See *FANU*, p. 36, 232.

3. The first examples quoted by the *KV* are for a neuter stem ending in short *a*, namely, *kuṇḍe tiṣṭhataḥ* 'the two pitchers are there' and *kuṇḍe paśya* 'look at the two pitchers.'

The *KV* notes that deletion of the stemfinal *a* has a chance to apply by P. 6.4.148. Then reference is made to *Vt*. I on P. 6.4.148 which says that with regard to *ŚĪ* a prohibition has to be phrased. Thereby P. 6.4.148 is set aside, and P. 6.1.87 is applied.

Further examples quoted are *dadhinī* 'the two items of sour milk,' *madhunī* 'the two items of honey,' *trapuṇī* 'the two items of tin' and *jatunī* 'the two items of lac.' For the last two examples see P. 7.1.17, under 4. The *Nyāsa* explains that in the examples *n* is inserted by P. 7.1.73. This rule says that *nUM* is inserted after the last vowel of a neuter stem ending in an *iK* vowel before a case ending which begins with a vowel.

4. The rule was earlier referred to in connection with P. 6.4.148 (b). See *AP* IX, p. 386 and 387 (Patañjali's rejection of *Vt*. I).

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.20 JAŚŚASOḤ ŚIḤ *'Śi* (comes) in place of *Jas* and *Śas* (after a neuter nominal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *Śi* for the pl. nom./ acc. endings after a neuter nominal stem.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*napuṃsakāt aṅgāt*) *jaśśasoḥ*. Here *napuṃsakāt* is continued from P. 7.1.19 and *aṅgāt* (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Auṅaḥ* from P. 7.1.18 is discontinued by *jaśśasoḥ*. The term *jaśśasoḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Jas* and *Śas* are the pl. nom. and acc. case endings introduced by P. 4.1.2. We note that in *jaśśasoḥ* P. 8.4.40 has been applied. The *vidheya* is *Śi*. It discontinues *ŚĪ* from P. 7.1.17.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *kuṇḍāni tiṣṭhanti* 'the pitchers are there,' *kuṇḍāni paśya* 'look at the pitchers,' *dadhīni* 'items of sour milk,' *madhūni* 'items of honey,' *trapūṇi* 'items of tin' and *jatūni* 'items of lac.' The *Nyāsa* explains that in these forms first *nUM* is inserted after the last vowel of a neuter stem ending in an *iK* vowel by P. 7.1.73, and that lengthening of what has become the prefinal vowel is by P. 6.4.8. For other examples of the latter rule see *AP* IX, P. 6.4.8, under 5.

4. Finally, the *KV* notes that the rule does not apply in *kuṇḍaśo dadāti* 'he gives pitcherwise.' The suffix *Śas* used here is a *taddhita* suffix prescribed by P. 5.4.43 in the sense of *vīpsā* 'complete coverage.' Compare Whitney § 1106.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.21 AṢṬĀBHYA AUŚ *'auŚ* (comes in place of *Jas* and *Śas*) after (the numeral base *aṅga*) *aṣṭā* "eight" '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *auŚ* for the pl. nom. and acc. endings added to *aṣṭā*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *aṣṭābhyaḥ* (*aṅgāt jaśśasoḥ*). Here *aṣṭābhyaḥ* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. It discontinues *napuṃsakāt* from P. 7.1.19. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1, and *jaśśasoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.20. The *vidheya* is *auŚ*. Since *auŚ* is *Śit*, it replaces the whole of the *sthānin* by P. 1.1.55.

3. There are two stem forms, *aṣṭā* and *aṣṭa*. Here, according to Whitney, § 483, *aṣṭā* is almost exclusively used in Vedic and Brāhmaṇa literature. *Aṣṭa* is also

used as the inflected form for the nom. / acc. for which the ṚgVeda uses *aṣṭau*. In P. 7.2.84 the stem is quoted as *aṣṭan*. According to this rule, the stemfinal *n* is replaced by *ā*. From *aṣṭa* + *ā* we derive *aṣṭā* by P. 6.1.102.

As noted by Whitney, § 308 c., *au* is the du. nom. / acc. ending for the masc. and fem. Instead, the Veda uses mostly *ā*. Then could *aṣṭau* / *aṣṭā* be originally a dual form? T. Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language*. London 1955, p. 259, compares the Avestan form *ašti*. This word refers to a measure of length meaning 'the width of four fingers.' From this it may be inferred that originally *aṣṭau* meant 'two groups of four fingers.'

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *aṣṭau tiṣṭhanti* 'eight are there' and *aṣṭau paśya* 'look at the eight.'

5. To point out the significance of the stem form *aṣṭā* in *aṣṭābhyaḥ*, the *KV* quotes the examples *aṣṭa tiṣṭhanti* 'the eight are there' and *aṣṭa paśya* 'look at the eight.' According to the *KV* the very mention of this stem form in long *ā* provides a clue, namely, that P. 7.2.84 is an optional rule. That is to say, the substitution of *ā* for the *n* of *aṣṭan* is optional. Thus, for instance, both *aṣṭābhyaḥ* and *aṣṭabhyah* are allowed.

How to arrive at the clue? The argument goes as follows: P. 7.2.84 teaches us to replace the *n* of *aṣṭan* by *ā*. As a result we obtain the stem *aṣṭā*. Now it is assumed that P. 7.1.21, which mentions *aṣṭābhyaḥ*, can only become applicable after P. 7.2.84 has been applied. That is to say, the form showing a lenghtened final vowel becomes the condition for the *auŚ*-substitution. This informs us that a form showing a non-lengthened vowel is also available. Moreover, the mention of *dīrghāt* '(after *aṣṭan*) ending in a long vowel' in P. 6.1.172 provides us with the same information. This rule tells us that the *asarvanāmasthāna* endings added after *aṣṭan* ending in a long vowel take the *udātta* accent From both instances we conclude that the substitution of *ā* for the *n* of *aṣṭan* taught by P. 7.2.84 is optional. Otherwise, the condition *dīrghāt* in P. 6.1.172 would be meaningless.

6. The next rule, P. 7.1.22, says that *luk*-deletion is applied to *Jas* and *Śas* after the numerals indicated as *ṣaṣ* (P. 1.1.24). They are *pañcan, ṣaṣ, saptan, aṣṭan, navan* and *daśan*. The *KV* points out that, therefore, the *auŚ*-substitution by P. 7.1.21 prescribed for *aṣṭan* is, in fact, an exception to P. 7.1.22. The reason stated by the *KV* is *nāprāpte tasminn idam ārabhyate* 'when that (rule, P. 7.1.22) has no chance but to apply, this (rule, P. 7.1.21) is phrased.' Compare Nāgeśa's opening statement on *PN*, *pbh*. 57, and note 1 in Kielhorn's translation of the *PN*, p. 321. The point

is simply that an *apavāda* is not applicable in any case which does not come under the general rule. Reference by the *KV* is to *Ślokavārttika* 1, *apavādaḥ* (*Mbh.* III, p. 248, line 1), and to Patañjali's comment *apavādatvād atrauśtvaṃ lukaṃ bādhiṣyate* 'here the *auŚ*-substitution will set aside the *luk*-deletion (by P. 7.1.22) because of its being an *apavāda* (to the *luk*-deletion).'

7. In a further comment on the same *Ślokavārttika* Patañjali offers a different reason. He says that P. 7.1.21 will overrule P. 7.1.22 (and not P. 2.4.71) because P. 7.1.22 is the nearer rule. This has been codified later on in *PN* as *pbh.* 61 : a rule prescribes or prohibits only that which is nearest to it.

According to P. 2.4.71, *luk*-deletion is applied to a case ending belonging to a *dhātu* or a *prātipadika*. The latter term includes cp. stems (P. 1.2.46). Now the argument of the *KV* is that, since P. 2.4.71 deals with the *luk*-deletion of internal case endings in cp.-formation, P. 7.1.21 cannot be an *apavāda* to P. 2.4.71. In other words, we cannot say that P. 7.1.21 is applicable in any case which does not come under P. 2.4.71, the reason being that P. 7.1.21 applies to non-cp. stems. Therefore P. 7.1.21 cannot set aside P. 2.4.71. On the other hand, P. 7.1.22 is applicable in all cases in which P. 7.1.21 applies. Therefore P. 7.1.21 can only be an *apavāda* to P. 7.1.22, and not to P. 2.4.71. The examples, borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh.* III, p. 247, line 20), are the *bv.* cps. *aṣṭaputra* 'one having eight sons' and *aṣṭabhārya* 'one having eight wives.' As explained by the *Nyāsa*, here *luk*-deletion of the internal case endings is applied, and there is no question of adding *auŚ*. Thereby the forms **aṣṭauputra* and **aṣṭaubhārya* are ruled out.

8. Referring to *Ślokavārttika* 1, *auś aghau* '*auŚ* (is added), except when an *uttarapada* (occurs after *aṣṭan*),' the *KV* notes that, on the other hand, the application of P. 7.1.21 is desired when *aṣṭan* occurs as the final member of a cp. The examples are *paramāṣṭau* 'the highest eight' and *uttamāṣṭau* 'the best eight.' Here *auŚ* is added to *aṣṭan* as the final constituent in a cp.

9. Finally, the *KV* observes that in the *bv.* cp. *priyāṣṭānaḥ*, to be analysed as *priyā aṣṭau yeṣām* 'to whom (pl.) eight are dear' the *auŚ*-substitution is not applied because there is no *ātva*. That is to say, here the stem form used is *aṣṭan*, not *aṣṭā*. P. 7.2.84 prescibes *ātva* (of the final *n* of *aṣṭan*) optionally. See under 5. above. Thus, when the *ā*-substitution is applied, we derive the form *priyāṣṭau*. Otherwise the form will read *priyāṣṭānaḥ*. The *Padamañjarī* points out that the *pūrvanipāta* of *priya* in the cp. is by *Vt.* II on P. 2.2.35.

10. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* containing two *Ślokavārttikas*. *Ślokavārttika* 1 starts with saying *auś aghau*. Here the word *aghu* is explained by Patañjali as *anuttarapade* 'when (*aṣṭan*) is not followed by a cp. constituent.' Thus *auŚ* is not added after *aṣṭan* when forming part of a cp. and followed by another cp. constituent. The examples quoted by Patañjali are *aṣṭaputraḥ* 'one who has eight sons' and *aṣṭabhārya* 'one who has eight wifes.' See under 7, above. This argument of the cp. constituents being *upasarjana* is not used in con-nection with *aṣṭan*. That is why we have *priyāṣṭau* by P. 7.1.21 and the optional form *priyāṣṭānaḥ* by P. 7.2.84. The *Nyāsa* states that P. 7.2.84 being *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* is not applied here. Therefore, P. 7.1.21 also is not applied in *priyāṣṭānaḥ*, see under 5. Why the same logic is not applied, is not clear. We have no evidence from outside grammatical literature to prove the optionality of P. 7.2.84.

The *Ślokavārttikas* make two more points. One is that P. 7.2.21 is an exception to P. 7.1.22 and not to P. 2.4.71. See under 6. above. The other is that the *auŚ*-substitution is only applied when lengthening of the final stem vowel has taken by P. 7.2.84 (*Mbh*. III, p. 248, line 9). The last line of *Ślokavārttika* 2 has no connection with the present rule, but is concerned with *Vt*. I on P. 7.1.23.

7.1.22 ṢAḌBHYO LUK '*luk*-deletion (takes place of *Jas* and *Śas*) after (the numeral base *aṅgas* called) *ṣaṣ*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing *luk* of the pl. nom. and acc. case suffixes in connection with the *ṣaṣ*-words.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ṣaḍbhyaḥ* (*aṅgebhyaḥ jaśśasoḥ*). *Ṣaṣ* is the designation given to the six numerals *pañcan*, *ṣaṣ*, etc. by P. 1.1.24. *Ṣaḍbhyaḥ* discontinues *aṣṭābhyaḥ* from P. 7.1.21. *Aṅgebhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Jaśśasoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.20. The *vidheya* is *luk*, defined by P. 1.1.61 and 2.4.71.

3. The *KV* quotes the examples *ṣaṭ tiṣṭhanti* 'six are there,' *ṣaṭ paśya* 'look at the six,' *pañca* 'five,' *sapta* 'seven,' *nava* 'nine' and *daśa* 'ten.' The *Nyāsa* explains that *n* is deleted by P. 8.2.7.

4. Referring to *PN*, *pbh*. 29, the *KV* says that the rule also applies to what ends in *ṣaṣ*, like in *paramaṣaṭ* 'the highest six' and *uttamaṣaṭ* 'the best six.' However, when *ṣaṣ* occurs as *upasarjana*, that is, as the subordinate membert of a cp. (P. 1.2.43), then the case endings *Jas* and *Śas* are not *luk*-deleted. For the meaning of

upasarjana in cp.-formation see *BDA*, n. 112. The examples quoted are *priyaṣaṣaḥ* 'those to whom six are dear' and *priyapañcānaḥ* 'those to whom five are dear.' These are *bv.* cps in which the *anyapadārtha* is the dominant meaning and in which the constitents' meanings are subordinate.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.23 SVAMOR NAPUṂSAKĀT '(*luk*-deletion takes place) of *sU* and *am* after a neuter (nominal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing *luk*-deletion of the two suffixes mentioned after a neuter nominal stem.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgebhyaḥ*) *svamor napuṃsakāt*. The word *ṣaḍbhyaḥ* from P. 7.1.22 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. It makes no sense to continue it in the present rule, because after the *ṣaṣ* numerals *sU* and *am* cannot be added. *Aṅgebhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Su* and *am* are the sg. nom. and acc. ending prescribed by P. 4.1.2. *Svamoḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. For *napuṃsaka* see P. 7.1.19, under 2. *Napuṃsakāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1 1 67. The *vidheya* is (*luk*) continued from P. 7.1.22.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *dadhi tiṣṭhati* 'sour milk is there,' *dadhi paśya* 'look at the sour milk,' *madhu tiṣṭhati* 'honey is there', *madhu paśya* 'look at the honey,' *trapu* 'tin' and *jatu* 'lac' (both sg. nom. or acc.).

4. Following *Vt.* I on the present rule, the *KV* initiates a grammatical argument. It centres on the example *tad brāhmaṇakulam* 'this is a brahmin family,' borrowed from Patañjali. Here the word *brāhmaṇakulam* is added to *tad* in order to show that *tad* is a neuter sg. nom. The *KV* then says that in *tad* the substitution of *a* (for the final *d* by P. 7.2.102) is set aside by *luk*-deletion, whether by *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'a conflict in which the earlier rule prevails,' or because P. 7.2.23 is *nitya*. For *pūrvavipratiṣedha* see *AP* IV, p. 20-28. A rule is said to be *nitya* when it remains applicable whether another rule is applied or not applied, and it is said to be *anitya* in the opposite case. See Nāgeśa on *PN*, *pbh.* 42. A *nitya* rule prevails over a *para* rule.

The *Nyāsa* notes that *pūrvavipratiṣedha* is not a serious contender, because *para* (in P. 1.4.2) means *iṣṭa* 'desired' anyway. See *Mbh.* I, p. 306, lines 9-10. Thereby all instances of *pūrvavipratiṣedha* are dismissed. In any case, the *KV* passes over the *pūrvavipratiṣedha* alternative, and concentrates on *nityatva*. The text then says that

by another rule, namely, P. 7.1.24, the *nimitta* 'condition for application' of the *luk*-deletion is destroyed, but not by P. 7.2.102 itself. Even after the application of P. 7.2.102, the *luk*-deletion rule P. 7.1.23 remains applicable, but this is not so after the application of P. 7.1.24, because this rule destroys the *nimitta* of P. 7.1.23.

The *KV* then quotes what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 47. According to this *pbh*., a rule whose condition is destroyed by a third rule (after a second rule has taken effect) is not regarded as *anitya*. That is to say, it still prevails. So, by this *pbh*., P. 7.1.23 is applied first. Once this *luk*-deletion rule is applied, there is no chance any more for P. 7.2.102 and P. 7.1.24, because this is forbidden by P. 1.1.63. Thus, according to the *KV*, the derivation of the sg. nom. form *tad* is as follows :

(1) *tad* + *sU* — P. 4.1.2
(2) *tad* + ° — P. 7.1.23
tad.

5. To decide which rule is to be applied first, when two rules become applicable simultaneously, both *nityatva* and the *siddha*-principle usually work equally well. Two examples are the derivation of the form *asau* 'that one (over there)' (sg. nom. masc.) and that of *aijyate* 'it was sacrificed.'

For *asau* we start from (1) *adas* + *sU*. At this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously. They are P. 6.1.68, which prescribes *lopa* of a suffix consisting of a single consonant after a stem ending in a consonant, and P. 7.2.107 (a), which prescribes the substitution of *au* for the *aṅga*-final of *adas* before a case ending. Which rule to apply? Here the rule which destroys the *nimitta* of the other rule is P. 7.2.107 (a). Therefore, whether by *nityatva* or by the *siddha*-principle, it should apply first, as follows : (2) *adaau* + *sU*. Now we cannot apply P. 6.1.68 which is conditioned by a preceding *haL* phoneme. Still, *sulopa* is desired. That is why Pāṇini had to phrase an additional rule, namely, P. 7.2.107 (b), *sulopaś ca*.

Then *aijyata*. At the stage *yaj* + *lAṄ* only the *aḍāgama* rule P. 6.4.71 is applicable. The *saṃprasāraṇa* rule P. 6.1.15 is not applicable, because there is no *Kit* suffix. In this situation the *siddha*-principle in what we call its extended version (see under 7.) tells us to look ahead. If subsequently the *saṃprasāraṇa* rule is going to destroy the *nimitta* of the augment rule, the latter rule is not applied first at the stage mentioned. Therefore no *aḍāgama* here. First *yaK* is added, which gives us *yaj* + *yaK* + *lAṄ*. At the next stage *saṃprasāraṇa* is applied by P. 6.1.15. Here *saṃprasāraṇa* is applied first because it destroys the *nimitta* of *aḍāgama* by P. 6.4.71.

Only then the *aḍāgama* rule is applied, whether by the *siddha*-principle (extended version) or by *nityatva*.

6. How does tradition proceed when three rules are involved? We will refer to the three rules involved as (A), (B) and (C). In its comment referred to under 4., above, the *KV* refers to what has become *PN*, *pbh.* 47. By this *pbh.* and the next one the *nityatva* or *anityatva* of a rule is decided on the basis of usage. Both the *pbhs* 47 and 48 are concerned with a sequence of three rules which become applicable in a given derivation. *Pbh.* 47 tells us that a rule or operation (A) whose cause of application is destroyed by another, subsequently applicable third rule (C) is not regarded as *anitya*. So rule (A) is first applied. Thus the order of rule application is (A), and thereafter (B) and (C), if possible. The example is *tad*. Here (B) and (C) cannot be applied any more.

Pbh. 48 tells us that, still, in some cases, such a rule (A) is regarded as *anitya*. So rule (A) is not first applied. According to *PN*, *pbhs* 43 and 44, the condition for *anityatva* is stated as *śabdāntarasya prāpnuvan* 'becoming applicable to (a wordform) which has undergone a change (after another rule has taken effect).' Thus, tradition as stated by *pbhs* 47-48 does not offer a clear guideline. We have to go by usage and apply rules or phrase additional rules in such a way that the desired form is derived, seeing the examples. An example for *pbh.* 48 is the form *dudyūṣati* 'he desires to play dice.' For the derivation see *STHĀNI*, Part II, p. 113. At the stage *div* + *saN* + *ŚaP* + *ti*, two rules become applicable, namely, (A) P. 6.1.9 for reduplication, and (B) 6.4.19 for the *ūṬH*-substitution of *v*. Here we apply P. 6.4.19 first because it is a special rule (*apavāda*) applicable to *v* in a particular environment. That gives us *diū* + *sa* + *a* + *ti*. Now the question is whether first to apply P. 6.1.9 (reduplication), or P. 6.1.77 (*yaṆ-ādeśa*). Here the application of the (A) rule P. 6.1.9 first would lead to a wrong form. Therefore, seeing the usage desired, we first apply P. 6.1.77, and thereafter P. 6.1.9. Thus the order of rule application is (B), (C), (A).

7. What is the difference between *nityatva* and the *siddha*-principle? One dif-ference lies in economy of statement. The *siddha*-principle is just one principle applicable in all cases concerned, whereas *nityatva* requires seven *pbhs*. Moreover, *nityatva* usually (with the exception of *pbhs* 47 and 48) takes into account two rules (A) and (B) only. The *siddha*-principle as a conflict-solving principle also takes into account two simultaneously applicable rules (A) and (B), and tells us that, if (B) changes the environment of (A), or destroys the *nimitta* of (A), it is to be applied first. But in what we will call the extended version the *siddha*-principle it takes into account the effect of subsequently applicable rule (B), in the case of two rules being

involved, or (C), in the case of three rules being involved, if this (B) or (C) rule destroys the *nimitta* of (A). In such a situation, when two rules are involved, the (A) rule is either not applied, or, when three rules are involved, it is applied after the application of (C).

As an example for the extended version of the *siddha*-principle we will take the form *dudyūṣati* again. Here three rules (A), (B) and (C), as defined above, are applicable. (A) is a reduplication rule, (B) is the *ūṬH*-substitution rule, and (C) is the *yaṆ-ādeśa* rule The (C) rule, which is conditioned by (B), destroys the *nimitta* of (A). Therefore the (A) rule is not applied first. In fact, it is applied last. Thus, by the extended version of the *siddha*-principle, we determine the order of rule application as (B), (C), (A). Accordingly, we come to the same result as shown before, by applying *pbh*. 48, but by a different way.

We note that 'extended' in the extended version of the *siddha*-principle does not necesarily mean that three rules must be involved. The extended version also applies, when two rules are involved, one of which becomes applicable later on in the *prakriyā* and which destroys the *nimitta* of an earlier applicable rule. In such a case, this earlier applicable rule is not applied. The extended version tells us to look ahead, and then to decide whether a rule is to be applied or not. See P. 7.1.65, under 2.

8. We have four *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that the *luk*-deletion prescribed by P. 7.1.23 applies also after *tyadādi* words. The example quoted by Patañjali is *tad brāhmaṇakulam*, referred to under 4, above. What Kātyāyana does here is precisely what is required by *PN*, *pbh*. 48. He phrases an additional rule. Supposing that P. 7.2.102 and 7.1.24 have a chance to prevail over P. 7.1.23, and seeing that the application of P. 7.1.24 would destroy the *nimitta* of P. 7.1.23, he specially prescribes the *luk*-deletion of the endings *sU* and *am* after the pronominal *aṅgas* called *tyadādi*, to justify the derivation of *tad*. On the basis of this *Vt*. the *KV* refers to *pbh*. 47.

Vts II-IV deal with four other rules which deal with neuter stems, namely, P. 7.1.19 (*Śī*), P. 7.1.20 (*Śi*), 7.1.23 (*luk*), P. 7.1.72 (*nUM*). The latter rule prescribes the augment *nUM* to be inserted after the last vowel of a neuter nominal *aṅga* before a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending. The underlying question is how to construe the word *napuṃsakāt* in P. 7.1.23. Is it to be construed directly with *aṅga*, as in *napuṃsakāt aṅgāt* 'after an *aṅga* which is neuter,' or do we assume a more complex construction by applying *pbh*. 23, as in *napuṃsakaḥ yaḥ śabdaḥ tadāntāt aṅgāt* 'after an *aṅga* which ends in a neuter word'? The difference becomes clear in *bv*. cp.-

formation. In the first alternative the *aṅga*, that is, the cp. stem, as a whole must be neuter. In the second alternative the *aṅga*, the final constituent of which must be neuter, need not be neuter, but can be masc. also. Here the first alternative is referred to as *śabdagrahaṇa* 'reference to (the gender of) a word as a whole,' whereas the second alternative is referred to as *arthagrahaṇa* 'reference to a gender meaning (belonging to a cp. constituent),' that is, reference to the neuter gender in our case.

Vts II and III state that in the case of *ŚiŚĪ-luk*-operations, etc. the word *napuṃsaka* is to be connected with *aṅga* as a whole, which, it qualifies. One example quoted by Patañjali in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. II is the *bv*. cp. *bahutrapu* 'one having much tin.' Here the constituent *trapu* is a neuter word. But the *aṅga* as a whole, that is, the *bv*. cp. stem, is not neuter. Therefore the rules mentioned above are not applicable. Accordingly, the du. form of the cp. is *bahutrapū*, and not **bahutrapuṇī*.

Vt. IV says that when a rule directly mentions a *prātipadika*, the rule applies to a masc. *bv*. cp. also. For instance, in P. 7.1.75 the neuter stems *asthi*, *dadhi*, etc. are directly mentioned. With the help of these stems we can derive a *bv*. cp., as in *priyadadhnā brāhmaṇena* 'by a brahmin who likes *dadhi*' by P. 7.1.75 (*an*-substitution for the final of *dadhi*) and P. 6.4.134 (*lopa* of the *a* of *an*). Although *dadhi* is neuter, the *bv*. cp. *priyadadhi* is masc. Here what is required is that *dadhi* as a cp. constituent must be neuter. But even in the masc. *bv*. cp. in which the neuter word *dadhi* figures as a constituent P. 7.1.75 is applicable.

7.1.24 ATO 'M '*am* (comes) in place of (*sU* and *am*) after (a neuter nominal base *aṅga*) ending in short *a*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *am* for two case endings after a neuter stem ending in short *a*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*svamoḥ napuṃsakāt*) *ataḥ* (*aṅgāt*). Here *svamoḥ* and *napuṃsakāt* are continued from P. 7.1.23. *Svamoḥ* refers to the case endings of the sg. nom. and acc. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.1.4. *Ataḥ* is interpreted as *adantāt* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). The *T* of *aT* in *ataḥ* refers to the short variety of vowels by P. 1.1.70. The *vidheya* is *am*. It discontinues the word *luk* from P. 7.1.22. Since *am* is *anekāl*, it replaces the whole of the suffixes mentioned.

The *Nyāsa* explains that the present rule is an *apavāda* to the *luk*-rule P. 7.1.22, and that the *T* is added in *ataḥ* for ease of pronunciation only, because the

question of long *ā* does not arise. A long stem vowel in final position is always shortened in the neuter by P. 1.2.47.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *kuṇḍaṃ tiṣṭhati* 'there is a pitcher,' *kuṇḍaṃ paśya* 'look at the pitcher, *vanam* 'forest' (both sg. nom. and acc.) and *pīṭham* 'seat' (both sg. nom. and acc.).

4. To point out the significance of the mention of *am*, the *KV* says that otherwise, that is, if only the single sound *m* had been stated, lengthening would be applicable. This can be shown in the derivation of the sg., nom. and acc. forms of a neuter word like *kuṇḍa*. The argument, as explained by the *Nyāsa*, goes as follows :

(1) *kuṇḍa* + *am*	P. 4.1.2

If in this stage *am* is replaced by *m*, the result would be

(2) *kuṇḍa* + *mm*	P. 1.1.54 (according to this rule, a substitute which comes in place of an immediately following item, in our case the stem *kuṇḍa*, replaces the initial of the following *sthānin* only)
(3) *kuṇḍa* + *m*°	P. 8.2.23

The *m* here is a *yañādi* suffix because it begins with a *yaÑ*-sound. Therefore, by P. 7.3.102, in which *yañi* is continued from P. 7.3.101, lengthening would apply to the final *a* of the stem *kuṇḍa*. That would give us

(4) *kuṇḍā* + *m*
**kuṇḍām*. This is not desired.

In the same way, since the rule says that *m* is the substitute of *sU*, we derive :

(1) *kuṇḍa* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *kuṇḍa* + *m*	P. 7.1.24
(3) *kuṇḍam*	

Here also lengthening would apply by P. 7.3.102. But *kuṇḍam* is the desired form.

The conclusion is that, in order to establish the desired forms, the substitute should be stated as *am*, and not as *m*.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.25 ADḌ ḌATARĀDIBHYAḤ PAÑCABHYAḤ '*adḌ* (comes in place of *sU* and *am*) after the five (neuter nominal base *aṅgas* quoted as) *Ḍatara*,etc., ending in short *a*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *adḌ* for the sg. nom. and acc. case endings after the neuter stem forms mentioned.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*napuṃsakebhyaḥ*) *ḍatarādibhyaḥ pañcabhyaḥ* (*adbhyaḥ aṅgebhyaḥ svamoḥ*). Here *napuṃsakebhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.23. The *gaṇa Ḍatarādi* is a sub-*gaṇa* of *sarvādi*. (Böhtlingk's edition, no. 241). It consists of the suffixes *Ḍatara* and *Ḍatama*, and the stems *itara*, *anya* and *anyatara*, all three of them meaning 'other.' *Ḍatara* and *Ḍatama* are *taddhita* suffixes mentioned in P. 5.3.92-93. They are added after the pronominal stems *kim*, *yat* and *tad* in the sense of 'one out of two' and 'one out of many.' Thus *katara* means 'who among two?' and *katama* 'who among many?' In fact, *Ḍatara* and *Ḍatama* stand for words ending in these suffixes, by the *tadantavidhi* (*pbh* 23). The stems *itara*, etc. are *avyutpanna* 'underivable' stems in the A. The *anubandha Ḍ* in *Ḍatara* and *Ḍatama* indicates deletion of the *ṭi*-portion of the preceding stem by P. 6.4.142. Thus from *kim* + *Ḍatara* we derive *katara*. *Adbhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.24. Its continuation is not indicated by the *KV*, but the stems mentioned end in short *a* anyway. *Aṅgebhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1, and *svamoḥ* from P. 7.1.23. The *vidheya* is *adḌ*. The actual suffix is *at*. Here the addition of the *anubandha Ḍ* enables us to to prevent lengthening by P. 6.1.102. Since *at* is *anekāl*, it replaces the whole of the suffixes mentioned by P. 1.1.55. It also discontinues *am* from P. 7.1.24.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *katarat tiṣṭhati* 'who out of two is there?,' *katarat paśya* 'look at whom out of two,' *katamat tiṣṭhati* 'who out of many is there?' *katamat paśya* 'look at whom out of many,' *itarat*, *anyatarat* and *anyat*, both a sg. nom. and a sg. acc., all three meaning 'something else.'

4. To point out the significance of the word *pañcebhyaḥ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *nemaṃ paśya* 'look at one.' Since *nema* is not one of the five items included in the *Ḍatara* sub-*gaṇa*, *at* is not added in the neuter. As a result, we do not derive the undesired form **nemat*.

5. Following *Vt*. I on the present rule, the *KV* says that that the *anubandha* *Ḍ* in *adḌ* has been mentioned to prevent lengthening by P. 6.1.102. in *katarat tiṣṭhati*. What the *Vt*. and the *KV* mean, is this. To derive the sg. nom. form *katarat*, we need the mention of *Ḍ*. That can be shown as follows :

(1) *katara* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *katara* + *at*	P. 7.1.25 (*at* without *Ḍ*)

At this stage P. 6.1.102 (*pūrvasavarṇadīrgha*) becomes applicable. It would lead to a single substitution in the form of long *ā*, as in **katarāt*. But if *Ḍ* is added to *at*, then the preceding final *a* of *katara* will be deleted by P. 6.4.143. Thereby the application of P. 6.1.102 is prevented.

5. Again following *Vt*. I on the present rule, the *KV* says that the mention of the *anubandha Ḍ* in *at* is not needed to account for the desired sg. acc. form in *katarat paśya*. The argument goes as follows :

(1) *katara* + *am*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *katara* + *at*	P. 7.1.25 (*at* without *Ḍ*)

Since *am-tva* 'the property of being *am*' belonging to the *sthānin* can be made available to the substitute *at* by *sthānivadbhāva* (P. 1.1.56), P.6.1.107, *ami pūrvaḥ*, being an *apavāda* to P. 6.1.102, will be applicable for *ekādeśa* 'single substitution.' Accordingly, we derive

(3) *katarat*
katarat.

Unfortunately, the application of *sthānivadbhāva* is wrong, because phonetic properties like being *a* and being *m*, are not transferable (P. 1.1.56, *analvidhau*). The conclusion, therefore, is that the mention of *Ḍ* in *at* in P. 7.1.25 is necessary to derive the sg. acc. form *katarat* also.

6. A question is raised. Why not simply prescribe *t* as as single sound sub-stitute instead of *atḌ*? In that case, we can correctly derive the sg. nom. and acc. forms, but we will have a difficulty in deriving the sg. vocative. As follows :

A. (1) *katara* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *katara* + *t*	P. 7.1.25 (*t* instead of *at*)
katarat.	

B. (1) *katara* + *am*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *katara* + *tm*	P. 7.1.25 (*t* instead of *at*); 1.1.54
(3) *katara* + *t*°	P. 8.2.23
katarat.	

C. (1) *katara* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2; 2.3.49
(2) *katara* + *t*	P. 7.1.25 (*t* instead of *at*)
(3) *katara* + °	P. 6.1.69. This rule prescribes the deletion of a single consonant which is preceded by a short vowel.
*katara.	

Although in A. and B. we may derive the desired form, this is not the case in C. Here the desired form is *katarat*. This form can only be derived, if the substitute prescribed by P. 7.1.25 is *at*. The reason is that *at* is not a single consonant. Therefore the deletion prescribed by P. 6.1.69 cannot be applied.

7. Finally, the *KV* quotes a *kārikā* which sums up the discussion explained above.

8. We have four *Vts* on the rule. For *Vt*. I see under 4 and 5 above. The *Vts* II-IV indulge in a commentators's subtleties. They add nothing to the interpretation of the A. *Vt*. IV is rejected by Patañjali.

7.1.26 NETARĀC CHANDASI 'in the Vedic language (*atḌ* does) not (come in place of *sU* and *am*) after the neuter nominal base *aṅga*) *itara* "other" '

1. This is a *pratiṣedhasūtra* noting that in the Vedic language *adḌ* is not sub-stituted for *sU* and *am* after *itara*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *chandasi itarāt* (*aṅgāt svamoḥ adḌ*). For *chandas* see P. 7.1.10, under 2. *Itara* is one of the stems mentioned in the *Ḍatara* sub-*gaṇa*. See P. 7.1.25, under 2. *Ataḥ* from P. 7.1.24 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. *Itara* ends in short *a* anyway. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Svamoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.23. *AdḌ* is the substitute element continued from P. 7.1.25. The *vidheya* is *na*.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *mṛtam itaram aṇḍam ajāyata* 'he prudmuced another dead egg' (*Maitr. S.* 1.6.12) and *vārtraghnam itaram* 'another one belonging to the slayer of Vṛtra' (sg. acc.) (source unidentified).

4. To point out the significance of the word *chandasi*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples, taken from the *bhāṣā*, *itarat kāṣṭham* 'another piece of wood' and *itarat kuṇḍam* 'another pitcher' (the Benares ed. reads *kuṇḍyam*).

5. The *KV* then raises a question. Suppose, we drop *na* from the present rule and put the remainder, *itarāc chandasi*, immediately after P. 7.1.24. *Am* is continued from this rule, so that *itarāc chandasi* would mean that after *itara* the endings *sU* and *am* are replaced by *am* in *chandas*. In that case *am* would become an exception to *adḌ* prescribed by P. 7.1.25. Not a bad idea. But then how to make sense of the statement of *na* in P. 7.1.26? The answer is that it serves to split the rule into two parts, (a) *na*, and (b) *itarāc chandasi*. Why that is assumed is made clear by the *Vt.* quoted next.

6. The *KV* finally quotes *Vt.* I on the rule, for which see below.

7. We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that in connection with P. 7.1.26 a prohibition (of *adḌ)* is to be phrased in any case, whether in *chandas* or in the *bhāṣā*. The examples quoted by Patañjali are *ekataraṃ tiṣṭhati* 'one out of two is there' and *ekataraṃ paśya* 'look at the one out of two.' Apparently, the form *ekatarat* is not used. Now, by P. 7.1.26 (a), *na*, we obtain a general prohibition for *adḌ* after *ḍatara* stems. and by P, 7.1.26 (b) we have a prohibition of the same *adḌ* for *itara* in the Vedic language. In the (b) rule *na* is continued.

Vt. II deals with *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, and therefore anticipates P. 7.1.27. It says that in the case of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* the substitution of a case ending (namely, *am* by P. 7.1.28) prevails over the neuter substitutions by conflict procedure (*vipratiṣedha* = *paravipratiṣedha*, P. 1.4.2). How *yuṣmad* and *asmad* could represent neuter stems at all is made clear by Patañjali who quotes the examples *tvaṃ brāhmaṇakulam* 'you (sg.), a brahmin family' and *yūyaṃ brāhmaṇakulāni* 'you (pl.), a brahmin family,' meaning that a particular person or particular persons belong to a brahmin family. The two derivations involved are as follows :

A. (1)	*yuṣmad* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*yuṣmad* + *am*	P. 7.1.28
(3)	*tv-ad* + *am*	P. 7.2.94; 7.2.91
(4)	*tv-a°* + *am*	P. 7.2.90
(5)	*tvam*	P. 6.1.107
	tvam.	

The application of P. 7.2.90 poses a difficulty. Traditionally, this rule is interpreted in two ways: (1) *lopa* replaces the phoneme in final position of the *aṅga yuṣmad* (by P. 1.1.52), and (2) *lopa* replaces the sequence *a* + *d* which is called *śeṣa* 'the remainder' after the part *yuṣm* has been replaced, according to P. 7.2.91. This amounts to *ṭilopa*. The idea presumably goes back to Kātyāyana, *Vt.* IV on P. 7.1.33. *Ṭilopa* is also assumed by Candragomin (5.4.57, which corresponds to P. 7.2.90). See Candragomin, Part II. p. 241. Thus, following interpretation (2), the derivation shown above goes as follows :

(4) *tv-°* + *am*	P. 7.2.90
tvam.	

However, interpretation (2), is not Pāṇini's idea. P. 7.2.90 does not say *ṭer lopaḥ*. Moreover, the application of P. 1.1.52 and of P. 6.1.97 suffices to derive the desired form.

B. (1) *yuṣmad* + *Jas*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *yuṣmad* + *am*	P. 7.1.28
(3) *yūy-ad* + *am*	P. 7.2.93; 7.2.91
(4) *yūy-a°* + *am*	P. 7.2.90
(5) *yūy-am*	P. 6.1.107
yūyam.	

Here also the remark about the interpretation of P. 7.2.90 made under A. applies. Accordingly, we can dispense with P. 6.1.107, and directly derive *yūyam* from stage (4).

The point made by the *Vt.* is that the *am*-substitution by P. 7.1.28 prevails over the *ŚIŚi*-substitutions prescribed by P. 7.1.19 and 20, because it is the *para* 'later' rule.

Actually, *Vt.* II is not required, because *yuṣmad* and *asmad* have no gender. Therefore P. 7.1.17, 20 and 23 cannot become applicable.

7.1.27 YUṢMADASMADBHYĀṂ ṄASO 'Ś '*aŚ* (comes) in place of *Ṅas* after (the pronominal base *aṅgas*) *yuṣmad* and *asmad*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *aŚ* for the gen. sg. ending *Ṅas* after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* (*aṅgābhyām*) *ṅasaḥ*. Here *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are the two pronominal stems assumed by Pāṇini as the uniform basis of derivation of the 1st and 2nd person pronouns. This assumption causes a number of derivational acrobatics. Actually, as stated by Whitney, § 491, these pronominal declensions are made up of fragments coming from various roots and combinations of roots. As for the reason of their selection as bases of derivation Whitney, § 494, notes that they are forms used to a certain extent, and allowed to be indefinitely used in derivation and composition. Whitney, § 491, also notes that the first and second person pronouns have no distinction of gender. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ṅasaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Ṅas* is the sg. gen. case ending mentioned in P. 4.1.2. The *vidheya* is *aŚ*. Being a *Śit* element it replaces the whole of the *sthānin* by P. 1.1. 55.

3. The examples borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh.* III, p. 251, line 22-p. 251, line 1) and quoted by the *KV* are *tava svam* 'the property belonging to you' and *mama svam* 'the property belonging to me.' The derivation of the form *tava* is as follows :

(1) *yuṣmad* + *Ṅas*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *yuṣmad* + *a*	P. 7.1.27; 1.1.55
(3) *tava-ad* + *a*	P. 7.2.96; 7.2.91
(4) *tava-a°* + *a*	P. 7.2.90
(5) *tav* *a*	P. 6.1.97 (twice applied)
tava.	

For the interpretation of P. 7.2.90 see P. 7.1.26, under 7.

For the derivation of *mama* supply the stem *asmad*, and then apply the same rules.

4. Referring to *Vts* I and II on the rule, the *KV* notes that the *anubandha* *Ś* of *aŚ* serves to delete the whole of the *sthānin* *Ṅas*. The reason is stated as follows : *anyathā hi ādeśavyapadeśaprakḷptyartham āder eva syāt tataś ca yo 'ci ityetan na syāt* 'because otherwise, (if *Ś* is not added, the substitution of *a* for *a* in *Ṅas*) would serve for the designation *ādeśa* coming into being. In that case, namely, if *Ś* is not added, the substitute would come in place of the initial phoneme of *Ṅas*, that is, the *a*, only (by P. 1.1.54), and, as a result, we could not prevent P. 7.2.89.' The statement by the *KV* is put very briefly. It requires much to be supplied, and it requires some explanation.

The implied objection to which the *KV* states the answer is as follows: What is the point in adding the *anubandha Ś* to the substitute *aŚ*? Even without the *Ś* we will understand, that the whole of *Ṅas* (*a* + *s*) is replaced by *a*, on the ground of *sāmarthya* 'the strength of the statement of the rule,' that is, because otherwise P. 7.1.27 would be redundant. Against this objection the answer maintains that the addition of *Ś* is purposeful and necessary.

The answer refers to P. 7.2.89. This rule says that the *d* of *yusmad* and *asmad* is to be replaced by *y* before a case ending which is *anādeśa* and which begins with a vowel (*aci* = *ajādau*). Here the word *anādeśa* is continued from P. 7.2.86. Böhtlingk in his translation of the rule renders it as *'wenn sie kein Substitut ist,'* as a *nañtatpurusa*. In P. 7.2.89 Böhtlingk translates '*nicht substituiert*,' apparently taking *anādeśa* as a *bv.* cp. Chandra Vasu translates 'not a substitute' in both cases. S. M. Katre, 1989, translates 'not subject to replacement' in both cases. The *y* replaces the final phoneme of a given stem by P. 1.1.52. The rule P. 7.2.89 is an *apavāda* to the following rule P. 7.2.90, which prescribes *lopa*. An example is *tvayā* 'by you.' It is derived as follows:

(1)	*yuṣmad* + *Ṭā*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*tva-ad* + *ā*	P. 7.2.97; 7.2.91
(3)	*tvad* + *ā*	P. 6.1.97

At this stage P. 7.2.89 becomes applicable. The sg. instr. ending *ā* is the original case ending. It is not a substitute nor has it been replaced. Thus we continue:

(4)	*tvay* + *ā*	P. 7.2.89
	tvayā.	

On the other hand, P. 7.2.89 is not applicable in the derivation of the nom. sg. *tvam* 'you.' The reason is that here *am* clearly is a substitute. This seems to corroborate the *nañtatpuruṣa* rendering. For the derivation see P. 7.2.26, under 7.

Now suppose that *Ś* is not added to *aŚ* in P. 7.1.27. Then the substitute will be *a*. By P. 7.1.27 and P. 1.1.54 it will replace the *a* of *Ṅas*. That would give us the following derivation for *tava*:

(1)	*yuṣmad* + *Ṅas*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*yuṣmad* + *as*	P. 7.1.27; 1.1.54

Stage (2) may easily lead to misunderstanding, because the *as* of stage (1) and the *as* of stage (2) look identical. In fact, the *ạ* of *as* in stage (2) is the replacement of the *a* of *as* in stage (1). The derivation continues :

(3) *tava-ad* + *as* P. 7.2.96
(4) *tavad* + *as* P. 6.1.97

At this point the question is whether P. 7.2.89 is applicable. As stated above, the application of this rule is subject to two conditions, stated as *anādeśe* (continued from P. 7.2.86) and *aci*. Since *a* is a substitute, and since, in any case, the original *as* of stage (1) has undergone substitution, albeit in part, P. 7.2.89 cannot become appli-cable. The derivation then continues :

(5) *tava°* + *as* P. 7.2.90
(6) *tav* *as* P. 6.1.97
**tavas.*

But this is not the desired form. We want *tava*. That is why the *anubandha Ś* in *aŚ* is purposeful. It prevents the part-substitution of *a* in *Ṅas* by P. 1.1.52, which leaves the final *s* intact. No scope is left for the argument of *sāmarthya* mentioned above. Thus the correct derivation is

(1) *yuṣmad* + *Ṅas* P. 4.1.2
(2) *yuṣmad* + *aŚ* P. 7.1.27
(3) *tava-ad* + *a* P. 7.2.96
(4) *tava-a°* + *a* P. 7.2.90
(5) *tava* P. 6.1.97 (twice applied)
tava.

For the interpretation of P. 7.2.90 see the remark made in connection with P. 7.1.26, under 7.

5. We have three *Vts* on the rule. *Vts* I and II have been discussed under 4, above. *Vt*. III does not add anything worthwhile to the discussion. On *Vt*. II a *Ślokavārttika* is quoted. It says that all substitutes taught by Pāṇini, son of Dākṣī, are substitutes of a *pada* as a whole For when there is a change (i.e., substitution) in a single part (of the *pada*) only, the *nityatva* 'eternity, i.e., unchangeability (of words)' cannot be upheld. The *Padamañjarī* on the *KV* here explains *pada* as 'a meaningful form.' The *Ślokavārttika* was quoted earlier in the *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. V on P. 1.1.20 (*Mbh*. I, p. 75, lines 13-14). It tries to impose peculiar Mīmāṃsā doctrines

on Pāṇini. Compare Agrawala, ²1963, p. 357. For Pāṇini as *dākṣīputra* see ibid., p. 8-10.

As stated by Patañjali, the discussion on whether words are *nitya* or *kārya* goes back to the *Saṃgraha* (*Mbh.* I, p. 6, lines 12-13). See further *PASPA*, p. 85-89, 108. According to the Mīmāṃsaka *nityatva* view of words, substitution and augmentation as assumed by grammar are merely notional operations. Linguistic reality is not changed thereby. The point of grammar as an analysis of language still remains useful.

7.1.28 ṄE PRATHAMAYOR AM '*am* (comes) in place of *Ṅe* and of the first two (classes of) case endings (after the pronominal base *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *am* for the sg. dat. ending and for the nom. and acc. case endings after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*yuṣmadasmadbyām aṅgābhyām*) *ṅeprathamayoḥ*. Here *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* is continued from P. 7.1.27. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ṅe* is the sg. dat. case ending introduced by P. 4.1.2. The *anubandha* *Ṅ* indicates that *guṇa* is to be applied to the vowels *i* and *u* immediately preceding the case suffix, by P. 7.3.111 The *KV* makes it clear that *Ṅe* and *prathamayoḥ* are to be regarded as separate words. The *Nyāsa* specifically states that *Ṅe* is an *avibhaktiko nirdeśaḥ* 'mention (of a form) without case ending.' *Prathamayoḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. Being used in the dual, it includes both the nom. and the acc. endings. The same form *prathamayoḥ* is used in P. 6.1.102 as a du. loc. in the sense of 'when the nom. and acc. case endings follow.' The *vidheya* is *am*. It discontinues *aŚ* from P. 7.1.27.

3. The examples quoted for *Ṅe* by the *KV* are *tubhyaṃ dīyate* 'it is given to you' and *mahyaṃ dīyate* 'it is given to me.' The derivation of *tubhyam* is as follows :

(1)	*yuṣmad* + *Ṅe*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*yuṣmad* + *am*	P. 7.1.28
(3)	*tubhy-ad* + *am*	P. 7.2.95; 7.2.91
(4)	*tubhy-a°* + *am*	P. 7.2.90
(5)	*tubhy-am*	P. 6.1.107
	tubhyam.	

For the interpretation of P. 7.2.90 see the remark made in connection with P. 7.1.26, under 7.

For the derivation of *mahyam'* supply the stem *asmad* and apply the same rules.

4. The examples quoted for *prathamayoḥ* by the *KV* are *tvam* and *aham* for the sg. nom., *yuvām* and *āvām* for the du. nom. and acc., *yūyam* and *vayam* for the pl. nom., *tvām* and *mām* for the sg. acc.

For the derivation of *tvam* see P. 7.1.26, under 7. *Aham* is derived as follows:

(1) *asmad* + *sU* P 4.1.2
(2) *asmad* + *am* P. 7.1.27
(3) *ah-ad* + *am* P. 7.2.94

Hereafter apply P. 7.2.90 and P. 6.1.107.

Yuvām is derived as follows:

(1) *yuṣmad* + *au* P. 4.1.2
(2) *yuṣmad* + *am* P. 7.1.28
(3) *yuv-ad* + *am* P. 7.2.92; 7.2.91
(4) *yuv-aā* + *am* P. 7.2.88
(5) *yuv-ām* P. 6.1.102
yuvām.

For the derivation of *āvām* supply the stem *asmad* and apply the same rules.

In the derivation of the pl. nom. forms *Jas* is replaced by *am* by P. 7.1.28. For the stem-substitutions apply P. 7.2.93.

In the derivation of the sg. acc. forms *am* is replaced by *am* by P. 7.1.28. For the stem-substitutions apply P. 7.2.97. Thereafter P. 7.2.87 and P. 6.1.102 are applied.

In the derivation of the pl. acc. forms the *a* of *Śas* is replaced by *n* by P. 7.1.29 and P. 1.1.54. Thereafter P. 7.2.87 and P. 6.1.102 are applied. The final *s* is deleted by P. 8.2.23.

Thus Pāṇini has succeeded in providing a fairly consistent derivation for the pronouns concerned, presumably with the minimum number of rules.

5. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali raises the question whether the word *prathamayoḥ* refers to *vibhaktis*, or to suffixes. That is to say, as explained by the *Nyāsa*, does *prathamayoḥ* refer to the nom. and acc. endings of all numbers, or just to *sU* and *au* which are the first two case endings mentioned in P. 4.1.2? The anwer is, to *vibhaktis*. To prove that this must have been Pāṇini's intention, Patañjali refers to P. 6.1.102 and some other rules, among them P. 7.1.29. For the latter rule the examples *yuṣmān / aṣmān brāhmaṇīḥ paśya* 'look at you / us, brahmin women' and *yuṣmān / asmān brāhmaṇakulāni paśya* 'look at you/ us, brahmin families' are quoted.

7.1.29 ŚASO NA '*n* (comes) in place of *Śas* (after the pronominal base *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *n* for *Śas* after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*yuṣmadasmadbhyām aṅgābhyām*) *śasaḥ*. Here *yuṣmad-asmadbhyām* is continued from P. 7.1.27. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Śasaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49, 54. *Śas* is the pl. acc. case ending introduced by P. 4.1.2. It discontinues *ṅe prathamayoḥ* from P. 7.1.28. The *vidheya* is *n*. It discontinues *am* from P. 7.1.28. *Na* in the rule is not to be taken as the negative particle. The better reading would be *naḥ*. See under 5.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* for the three genders are *yuṣmān brāhmaṇān* 'you (pl. acc.) brahmins,' *yuṣmān / asmān brāhmaṇīḥ* 'you / us (pl. acc.) brahmin women' and *yuṣmān / asmān kulāni* 'you / us (pl. acc.) families.'

For the derivation of the pl. acc. forms see P. 7.1.28, under 4.

4. The *KV* notes that P. 6.1.103 only applies in the masculine gender. Therefore we can derive *yuṣmān brāhmaṇān*, but not the examples quoted for the fem. and the neuter. Then it dawns on the *KV* that the first and second person pronouns may have no gender distinction at all. For similar examples see P. 7.1.28, under 5.

5. Candragomin, Part I, p. 166, reads the rule as *śaso naḥ*. Thereby the substitute is clearly indicated as *n*.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.30 BHYASO BHYAM '*bhyam* (comes) in place of *bhyas* (after the pronominal base *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *bhyam* for *bhyas* after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*yuṣmadasmadbhyām aṅgābhyām*) *bhyasaḥ*. Here *yuṣmad-asmadbhyām* is continued from P. 7.1.27. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Bhyasaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Bhyas* in the present rule refers to the pl. dat. ending introduced by P. 4.1.2. For the substitution of *bhyas* as the pl. abl. ending a separate rule is phrased, namely, P. 7.1.31. *Bhyasaḥ* discontinues *śasaḥ* from P. 7.1.29. The *vidheya* is *bhyam*. It discontinues *na* from P. 7.1.29.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *yuṣmabhyaṃ dīyate* 'it is given to you (pl.)' and *asmabhyaṃ dīyate* 'it is given to us.'

4. Taking its cue from the *bhāṣya* on the present rule, the *KV* says that after applying the *bhyam*-substitute and P. 7.2.90, there is an undesired chance for applying the *e*-substitution by P. 7.3.103. This rule prescribes the substitution of *e* for *a* in final position of an *aṅga* before a *jhaL* sound. *JhaL* includes *bh*. The ensuing derivation would be as follows :

(1)	*yuṣmad + bhyas*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*yuṣmad + bhyam*	P. 7.1.30
(3)	*yuṣma° + bhyam*	P. 7.2.90
(4)	*yuṣme + bhyam*	P. 7.3.103
	**yuṣmebhyam*.	

But this is not the desired form. We want *yuṣmabhyam*. Following Patañjali, the *KV* points out that we can prevent the *e*-substitution by *PN*, *pbh*. 92. This *pbh*. tells us that, once an operation on an *aṅga* has been applied, we are not supposed to apply another *aṅga*-operation on the same stem. However, according to Nāgeśa (*PN*, Part I, p. 173, lines 13-15), the *pbh*. is *anitya* 'not always valid.'

5. But there is another possibility to arrive at the desired form. It requires both a different substitute, namely, *abhyam*, and a different interpretation of P. 7.2.90. *Abhyam* can be had as substitute by supposing that in P. 7.2.30 sandhi has

been applied by P. 6.1.109. In the different interpretations of P. 7.2.90 the word *śeṣa* in the rule is taken to refer to the sequence *a* + *d* in the stems *yuṣmad* / *asmad*. This sequence, in effect, represents the *ṭi*-portion of the two stems. Then, if the *lopa* prescribed by P. 7.2.90 is taken to concern this *ṭi*-portion, we must accept that the substitute prescribed by P. 7.1.20 is *abhyam*, in order to arrive at the desired form *yuṣm°* + *abhyam*. This is what the *KV* has in mind when saying that some grammarians accept *abhyam* as a substitute (instead of *bhyam*) in order to prevent the *e*-substitution by P. 7.3.103.

Actually, the opinion of the grammarians referred to by the *KV* as *kecit*, provides the better solution. It implies that P. 7.1.30 should be read as *bhyaso 'bhyam*, which makes *abhyam* the substitute. This is borne out by Candragomin's reading of the rule. See Candragomin, Part 1, p. 166. What remains surprising is that the *KV* refers to this opinion by saying *kecit* which usually is taken to indicate disapproval. Compare *ANA*, n. 296.

6. Finally, the *KV* refers to the discussion in the *bhāṣya* regarding the accent rule P. 6.1.161. For the discussion see under 7, below.

7. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali raises the question whether the rule refers to *bhyam* or to *abhyam* as a substitute. If *bhyam*, then two rules become applicable, namely, P. 7.2.90 and P. 7.3.103. If *abhyam*, then also two rules become applicable, namely, P. 7.2.90 and P. 6.1.161, which says that an *anudātta* vowel is replaced by *udātta*, when the *udātta* vowel preceding the *anudātta* vowel is deleted.

Let us consider the derivation of *yuṣmadbhyam* taking into account accentuation, and start from *yuṣmad* + *abhyam*, as follows :

(1) *yuṣmád* + *abhyam*	*Phiṭsūtra* 1.2; P. 3.1.4
(2) *yuṣmá°* + *abhyam*	P. 7.2.90
(3) *yuṣmábhyam*	P. 6.1.97; 8.2.5
yuṣmábhyam.	

This is the attested accentuation, see Whitney, § 401 a.

If we start the derivation from *yuṣmád* + *bhyam*, the result is as follows :

(2) *yuṣmá°* + *bhyam*	P. 7.2.90
(3) *yuṣmé* + *bhyam*	P. 7.3.103

*yusmébhyam.

Here P. 6.1.161 is not applicable at all, but P. 7.3.103 is, which leads to the wrong form. Patañjali's answer to the question raised is that it does not matter whether we assume *bhyam* or *abhyam*. To prevent the undesired application of P. 7.3.103 in the second example, Patañjali invokes the *pbh. aṅgavṛtte punar vṛttāv avidhir niṣṭhitasya* 'when an operation in the *aṅgādhikāra* has been applied (and another *aṅga*-operation) becomes applicable again, (then there is) an absence of application (for this latter operation regarding the form concerned) as long as it is *niṣṭhita* "finally established" (without the latter rule).' This has later become *PN, pbh.* 92, without the word *niṣṭhitasya*, as noted by Nāgeśa. See *PN*, Part I, p. 173, lines 14-15.

One objection remains. To justify it, Patañjali refers to P. 6.1.161 and to *Vt.* IV on this rule. If we consider that P. 7.2.90 prescribes *ṭilopa* (see P. 7.1.26, under 7), we derive the derivational stage *yuṣm°* + *abhyam*. Here the whole suffix is *anudātta* by P. 3.1.4. Then how to justify the *udātta* of *á* in *yuṣmábhyam*? That is where P. 6.1.161 comes in. The rule, in combination with the *Vt.*, says that when an *udātta* vowel (like *á* in *yuṣmá°*) is deleted, then the following vowel in initial position, in our case, the *a* of *abhyam*, becomes *udātta*, then *á*. The *Vt.* says that we can manage because the initial syllable has *udātta*. That gives us the desired form *yusmábhyam*.

7.1.31 PAÑCAMYĀ AT '*at* (comes in place of *bhyas*) of the fifth case endings (after the pronominal base *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *at* for the pl. abl. case ending after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*yuṣmadasmadbhyām aṅgābhyām*) *pañcamyāḥ* (*bhyasaḥ*). Here *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* is continued from P. 7.1.27. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Pañcamyāḥ* qualifies *bhyasaḥ* continued from P. 7.1.30. *Pañcamī* (sc. *vibhakti*) is the name used in Sanskrit grammar for the ablative case endings. Compare P. 2.3.28. For *bhyasaḥ* see P. 7.1.30, under 2. The *vidheya* is *at*. It discontinues *bhyam* (or *abhyam*) from P. 7.1.30.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *yuṣmad gachanti* 'they go away from you (pl.)' and *asmad gacchanti* 'they go away from us.'

4. The derivation of *yuṣmat* is as follows :

(1) *yuṣmat + bhyas* P. 4.1.2
(2) *yuṣmat + at* P. 7.1.31
(3) *yuṣm-a° + at* P. 7.2.90
(4) *yuṣm- at.* P. 6.1.97
yuṣmat.

For the derivation of *asmat* supply the stem *asmad* and apply the same rules.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.32 EKAVACANASYA CA 'also, (*at* comes) in place of the singular (abl. case ending after the pronominal base *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitute *at* for the sg. abl. case ending after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*yuṣmadasmadbhyām aṅgābhyāṃ pañcamyāḥ*) *ekavacanasya*. Here *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* is continued from P. 7.1.27. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Pañcamyāḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.31. *Ekavacanasya* qualifies *pañcamyāḥ*. *Ekavacana* is the term used in Sanskrit grammar for the singular number. Compare P. 1.4.22. *Ekavacanasya* discontinues *bhyasaḥ* from P. 7.1.30. The *vidheya* is *at*, continued from P. 7.1.31.

The word *ca* serves a a boundary marker. See *FANU* 1984, p. 36, 232.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *tvad gacchanti* 'they go away from you (sg.).' and *mad gacchanti* 'they go away from me.'

4. The derivation of *tvat* is as follows :

(1) *yuṣmad + ṄasI* P. 4.1.2
(2) *yuṣmad + at* P. 7.1.32
(3) *tva-ad + at* P. 7.2.97; 7.2.91
(4) *tva-a° + at* P. 7.2. 90
(5) *tvat* P. 6.1.97 (twice applied)
tvat.

For the interpretation of P. 7.2.90 see the remark made in connection with P. 7.1.26, under 7.

For the derivation of *mat* supply the stem *asmad* and apply the same rules.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.33 SĀMA ĀKAM '*ākam* (comes) in place of *sām* (after the pronominal base *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *ākam* for the pl. gen. case ending quoted as *sām* after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*yuṣmadasmadbhyām aṅgābhyām*) *sāmaḥ*. Here *yuṣmad-asmadbhyām* is continued from P. 7.1.27. *Aṅgābhyām* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sāmaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Sām* is the pl. gen. case ending *ām* to which the augment *sUṬ* has been prefixed by P. 7.1.52 and P. 1.1.46. It, therefore, is a composite case ending. *Sāmaḥ* discontinues *ekavacanasya* from P. 7.1.32. The *vidheya* is *ākam*. It discontinues *at* from P. 7.1.31 Thus the rule means that *ākam* replaces the case ending *ām* to which *suṬ* has been prefixed.

We note that Candragomin, Part 1, p. 166, formulates the rule as *āma ākam*, but both in the *Mbh.* and in the *KV* the rule is transmitted as *sāma ākam*. See further under 3 and 8, below.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *yuṣmākam* 'of you. (pl.)' and *asmākam* 'of us.' While deriving the form *yuṣmākam* we have to keep in mind three rules. They are (A) P. 7.2.89, (B) P. 7.2.90 and (C) P. 7.1.52. Rule (A) contains two conditions, *aci*, that is, *ajādau* 'if beginning with a vowel' and *anādeśe* 'if not a substitute.' Both conditions concern the case ending. It should begin with a vowel, and it should not be a substitute. If the two conditions are met, rule (A) prescribes the substitution of *y* for the final phoneme of the *aṅgas yuṣmad* and *asmad*. Rule (B) contains one condition, namely, *śeṣe* 'in the remaining cases,' that is, in the cases not covered by P. 7.2.86-89. If this condition is met, rule (B) prescribes *lopa*. According to P. 1.1.52, *lopa* is of the final phoneme of a stem. Rule (C) prescribes the prefixation of the augment *sUṬ* for the case ending *ām* added after a pronominal stem ending in short *a*. In rule (C) *āt* is continued from P. 7.1.50.

Now suppose, P. 7.1.33 reads *āmaḥ* instead of *sāmaḥ*. Accordingly, the first stage of the derivation of *yuṣmākam* would be

(1) *yuṣmad* + *ām*

Here the difficulty is that at this stage P. 7.2.89 becomes applicable immediately, because *ām* begins with a vowel, and because it is not a substitute. But the application of P. 7.2.89 leads to an undesired next stage, namely,

(2) **yuṣmay* + *ām*

How to prevent that? It can be done in a simple way, namely, by substituting *ākam* for *ām* in stage (2). *Ākam* is an *ādeśa*. Therefore P. 7.2.89 cannot become applicable. This being the case, P. 7.2.90 applies. That gives us

(2) *yuṣmad* + *ākam*	P. 7.1.33
(3) *yuṣma°* + *ākam*	P. 7.2.90

At this stage the question is whether P. 7.1.52 becomes applicable. The presupposition for its becoming applicable is *sthānivadbhāva* by P. 1.1.56, namely, between the assumedly original (*sthānin*) *ām* and the *ādeśa ākam*. Tradition (Kātyāyana, Patañjali) accepts *sthānivadbhāva* here, and, consequently, puts itself in a bind, as will be shown hereafter. However, P. 1.1.56 contains the exception *analvidhau*. That is to say, *sthānivadbhāva* applies except when the question is of rules which require the physical presence of the *sthānin* for their operation. See *STHĀNI*, Pt. I, Note (9). P. 7.1.52 requires the physical presence of the case ending *ām*. Since in stage (3) *ām* is no longer physically present, and since the property *āmtva* 'being *ām*' is not transferable, P. 7.1.52 is not applicable. The derivation then continues

(4) *yuṣmākam*	P. 6.1.101
yuṣmākam.	

For the derivation of *asmākam* supply the stem *asmad* and apply the same rules.

Simple comme bonjour. But, of course, the presupposition is that the original rule reads *āma ākam*. For that we have not a single shred of manuscript evidence.

Now put it the other way : *sthānivadbhāva* between *ām* and *ākam* is accepted. Therefore P. 7.1.52, which prescribes the augment *sUṬ* to be prefixed to *ām*, becomes applicable. That gives us

(4) *yuṣma* + *ṣUT* + *ākam*	P. 7.1.52
**yuṣmasākam.*	

But this is not the desired form. We want *yusmākam*. Thus the problem is, how to get rid of *sUṬ*. We note that the problem is due to the assumption of *sthānivadbhāva*. So much for the assumed reading *āma ākam* of P. 7.1.33. But in the meantime the traditionally accepted reading of the rule is *sāma ākam*.

4. The *KV* states that *sām* in the rule is understood as the pl. gen. ending containing the augment *sUṬ*. That *sām* coming after *yuṣmad* and *asmad* is replaced by *ākam*.

Then a question is raised. What purpose is served by understanding *sāmaḥ* as containing *sUṬ*? Because at the time when the substitute *ākam* is introduced in the derivation, *sUṬ* is not there. Following Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. VI on the present rule, the answer given is that the very mention of *ām* as containing *sUṬ* is for the sake of the disappearance (*nivṛttyartham*) of that *sUṬ* which is subsequently introduced (*bhāvin*). The reason for the answer is that once the substitute *ākam* has been introduced and P. 7.2.90 has been applied, *sUṬ* becomes applicable (by P. 7.1.52) because *yuṣmad* and *asmad* end in short *a*, and because *sthānivadbhāva* is (wrongly) assumed between *ām* and *ākam*. But that *sUṬ* ceases to be there once it has been introduced because it has has been already included in the *sthānin ām*.

Then what is the derivation of *yuṣmākam* which the *KV* has in mind? It must be as follows :

(1)	*yuṣmad + ām*	P.4.1.2; in this *ām sUṬ* has been included
(2)	*yuṣmad + ākam*	P. 7.1.33

Here P. 7.2.89 cannot apply because *ākam* is an *ādeśa*. The derivation continues :

(3)	*yuṣma° + ākam*	P. 7.2.90
(4)	*yuṣma + sUṬ + ākam*	P. 7.1.52

Here P. 7.1.52 is applied on account of *sthānivadbhāva*, and because *yuṣma* ends in short *a*. But, according to the *KV*, the *sUṬ* added here is of merely theoretical interest only, since it has already been included in *ām* mentioned as *sām* in P. 7.1.33. Apparently, to the *KV*, *sām* has been stated in the rule as a precaution against introducing *sUṬ* in the *prakriyā*. So for all practical purposes we may neglect it. The derivation continues :

(5) *yuṣmākam* P. 6.1.101
yuṣmākam.

5. The next question raised by the *KV* is, why does the rule say *ākam* and not simply *akam?* In the latter case, a *mātrā* could be saved. Put briefly, the answer by the *KV* is that the long vowel *ā* in *ākam* is needed to ensure the application of P. 6.1.101 (*savarṇadīrgha*).

In the statement by the *KV* the word *iti* is used twice. The first and second clauses ending with *iti* state the answer to an objection. The objection to be supplied is that that the *a* in the proposed reading *akam* is futile. The reason is that the application of P. 6.1.97 in the stage *yuṣma* + *akam* will result in *a* anyway, and that we might as well read *kam*. The answer points out that the *a* is not futile, because the very fact of its being stated will prevent the *e*-substitution by 7.3.103 Thereby the proposal to read *kam* instead of *akam* is rejected. Accordingly, we retain the stage *yuṣma* + *akam*. But here, after the application of P. 7.2.90, the *pararūpa-ekādeśa* rule P. 6.1.97 would apply. That would give us the form **yuṣmakam*, which is not desired. The conclusion, not stated by the *KV* in so many words, is that the long *ā* of *ākam* is to be retained, so that we can apply P. 6.1.101. That gives us the form *yuṣmākam* which is the desired form.

6. We have six *Vts* on the rule. The question to which they provide alternative answers is phrased by Patañjali as what purpose is served by adding *sUṬ* to *ām* in the rule?

Vt. I says that the form *sām* is mentioned because of the statement that a substititute comes (in the place of x) according to what is directly mentioned in a rule. As explained by Patañjali, reference is to the *pbh. nirdiṣyamānasya ādeśā bhavanti*. Since *sām* is directly stated as the *sthānin* by P. 7.1.33, the substitute *ākam* comes in place of that only. We note that the *Vārttikakāra* knows the reading *sāma ākam.*

But what is *sām*? According to Patañjali, it is a composite case ending consisting of *ṣUT* + *ām*, the latter being known from P. 4.1.2. Patañjali then says that it is desired that the *ākam*-substitution should be in place of *ām* occurring along with the augment *sUṬ*. But that we cannot have without a special effort. That is to say, unless Pāṇini had stated *sām* as the *sthānin*, we could not account for the subsequent disappearance (*nivṛtti*) of *sUṬ*. That is why the *s* is added in *sāma ākam.*

Vt. II rejects *Vt*. I. It refers to *Vt*. I on P. 7.2.102, which says that the *a*-substitution by P. 7.2.102 holds good for *tyadādi* words up to *dvi* only. Therefore it does not apply to *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, and, consequently, we cannot replace the final consonant of these two stems by *a* before a case ending by P. 7.2.102. Consequently, we cannot apply *sUṬ* which requires stems ending in short *a*. The point of the *Vt*. is that the *s* in *sām* is not needed. The *Vt*. does not mention P. 7.2.90. That mention comes in the following *Vt*.

Vt. III says that a prohibition of *sUṬ* is required. The reason is that we understand that deletion is conditioned by substitution. That is to say, unless we substitute *ākam* for *ām*, we cannot prevent the application of P. 7.2.89, and allow the application of P. 7.2.90. But, after *ākam* has been substituted for *ām*, the substitute *ākam* will be regarded as *ām* by *sthānivadbhāva*. So *sUṬ* will be applicable. This is not desired. That also is a reason to prohibit *sUṬ*. Patañjali explains that the question of *sUṬ* comes after *ām* has been replaced by *ākam*.

Vt. IV rejects *Vt*. III by mentioning the *ṭilopa*-interpretation of P. 7.2.90. See P. 7.1.26, under 7. According to this interpretation, the application of P. 7.2.90 results in the stems *yuṣm* and *asm*. Here *sUṬ* cannot be applied by P. 7.1.52, because the stems do not end in short *a*.

But then the *Vt*. introduces another idea, namely, that we must assume *ṭilopa* to prevent the addition of the fem. ending *ṬāP* (P. 4.1.4). If *tilopa* is applied, the result will be *yuṣm / asm*. Here we cannot add the fem. suffix *ṬāP* by P. 4.1.4, because that also requires a stem ending in short *a*. Apparently, the *Vt*. takes the view that *yuṣmad* and *asmad* can be indicative of gender.

Vt. V rejects the new purpose introduced by *Vt*. IV It says that the prescription of *ṭilopa* in order to prevent the addition of *ṬāP* makes no sense, because *yuṣmad* and *asmad* have no gender.

Patañjali rejects *Vt*. V. He admits that *yuṣmad* and *asmad* have no gender, but he thinks that we don't need a statement (*Vt*. V) to that effect. The *bhāṣya* then enters into a discussion about how gender is known. The translation of the *bhāṣya* is as follows : 'Even if it is not indicated as such by a particular word, it will be understood. In the case of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* a difference in gender is not indicated. There is a reason why that is so. Which is the reason? *Yo 'sau viśeṣavācī śabdas tadāsāṃnidhyāt* "because the gender-differentiating word (i.e., a substantive) has not been put near (to *yuṣmad / asmad*)." Come on, sir, you must pronounce that (gender-differentiating word). (Then) that difference (in gender) will be understood.'

(Note. According to Kaiyata and Nāgeśa, *viśeṣavācī śabdaḥ* means the fem. suffix *ṬāP*.)

(Objection) 'But that need no be so. Because, certainly, a (gender) meaning is not based on (a particular) wordform. Then what? Certainly, a (particular) wordform is based on a (gender) meaning. This we have to consider like this. The form which gender (*artharūpa*) takes is of such a nature that here (in the case of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*) a difference (in gender) is not understood. And that is for cerrtain. Because by him who thinks that the difference (in gender) is not understood because the gender-differentiating word has not been put near, the (gender) difference in *dṛṣad* "a rock" and *samidh* "a faggot" (which are both fem. words) is not understood either.'

To explain, *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are genderless forms. We cannot say, like in the case of adjectives, that their gender is decided by that of an adjoining substantive. Between *yuṣmad / asmad* and the following substantive there is no agreement.in gender, precisely because *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are genderless. Apparently, reference by means of the first and second person pronouns is such that the question of gender is superfluous. A different point is the gender of nouns and adjectives. Nouns in Sanskrit have a fixed gender, either masc., fem., or neuter For fem. nouns gender is indicated by particular word-derivational suffixes like *ṄIP* or *ṬāP*, or it is assumed by convention. Adjectives do not have a fixed gender. Their gender is determined by that of the noun they qualify, by means of agreement. But there are nouns in Sanskrit the fem. gender of which is not clear from the wordform, because they end in a consonant. Examples are *dṛṣad* and *samidh*. In such cases the gender is only known from that of an adjoining adjective.

So we have four cases :

(1) *yuṣmad / asmad*. No gender. *Yuṣmad* and *asmad* are *aliṅga*.

(2) The other pronouns do show variation in gender, as shown by the variation in case endings, according to the gender of the item referred to.

(3) Nouns. Traditionally, a difference is made between gender as a *śabdadharma* 'wordform-property,' that is, grammatical gender, and gender as an *arthadharma* 'property of the thing-meant,' i.e., natural gender. Generally, nouns are not variable in gender. In cases like *dṛṣad* and *samidh* the gender is purely conventional. In such cases the gender is known only from the adjoining adjective.

(4) Adjectives. Variable in gender. Gender shown by agreement with an adjoining noun.

Vt. VI states the *Vārttikakāra's* conclusion. It says that, therefore, taking into account the arguments put forward by the previous *Vts*, *sUṬ* must be prohibited. But Patañjali mentions an alternative. That is to say, *sUṬ* need not be prohibited. We can manage by the statement of *sām* in the rule. Why disallow *sUṬ* in the derivation of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* even when *ām* is mentioned along with *s* in *sāmaḥ*? We will understand that the substitute *ākam* comes in place of that *sām* for which *sUṬ* is subsequently introduced. Otherwise the mention of *s* (in *sāmah*) would make no sense.

7. Our conclusion is that the difficulties faced by tradition in interpreting P. 7.1.33 read as *sāma ākam* are caused by the assumption of *sthānivadbhāva*, itself caused by the misinterpretation of the word *analvidhau* in P. 1.1.56. We may go even a step further and propose that the reading of P. 7.1.33 as *sāma ākam* is based on the same misinterpretation, and that the original Pāṇinian reading, lost to the *Vārttikakāra* and Patañjali, should be *āma ākam*. But, as stated under 3, above, we have no manuscript evidence, and cannot have that. The proposal is merely based on inference.

Does this mean that Candragomin, referred to under 2, above, is right? Yes, in as far as the reading is concerned, but not in as far his derivation of the forms *yuṣmākam* / *asmākam* is concerned. He justifies the form *yuṣmākam* by changing the wording of P. 7.2.90 into *śeṣe lopo 'daḥ* (C. 5.4.57), which amounts to *ṭilopa* 'deletion of the *ṭi*-portion (of the stems *yuṣmad* and *asmad*),' and then applying P. 7.1.33.

8. One final point. In the stage *yusma* + *sUṬ* + *ākam* the question may be raised whether [*sUṬ* + *ākam*] as a whole can be replaced, namely, by *ākam*, in order to get rid of *sUṬ*. Does tradition provide evidence for the substitution of an augment along with the element to which it has been added? We have found one example in connection with P. 6.4.19 (a) *chvoḥ śūṭh*. Here, according to Patañjali, *ch* stands for *satuk ch* '*ch* accompanied by *tUK*.' That *t* + *ch*, which becomes *cch* (P. 8.4.40), is replaced by *ś*. But we have rejected this construction as *apāṇinīya* by invoking the *siddha*-principle. See *AP* IX, P. 6.4.19 (a), under 6.

7.1.34 ĀTA AU ṆALAḤ *'au* (comes) in place of *ṆaL* after (a verbal base) *aṅga* ending in long *ā*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *au* for the pf. finite verb ending stated as *ṆaL*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ātaḥ* (*aṅgāt*) *ṇalaḥ*. Here *ātaḥ* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. It is interpreted to mean *ādantāt* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ṇalaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. It discontinues *sāmaḥ* from P. 7.1.33. *ṆaL* is the pf. sg. first or third person ending introduced by P. 3.4.82. The *vidheya* is *au*. It dicontinues *ākam* from P. 7.1.33.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *papau* 'I have / he has drunk,' *tasthau* 'I have / he has stood,' *jaglau* 'I have / he has felt weary' and *mamlau* 'I have / he has withered.' The verbal bases are *pā-* (*Dhp.* 1.972), *sthā-* (*Dhp.*1.975), *glai-* (*Dhp.* 1. 952) and *mlai-* (*Dhp.* 1.953).

The derivation of *jaglau* is as follows :

(1) *glai-*	*Dhp.* 1. 952 where *ai* is replaced by *ā* P. 6.1.45
(2) *glā-* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115
(3) *glā* + *glā* + *lIṬ*	P. 6.1.8
(4) *glā* + *glā* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78 (or *miP* is added)
(5) *glā* + *glā* + *ṆaL*	P. 3.4.82
(6) *glā* + *glā* + *au*	P. 7.1.34
(7) *gla* + *glā* + *au*	P. 7.4.59
(8) *ga* + *glā* + *au*	P. 7.4.60
(9) *ja* + *glā* + *au*	P. 7.4.62
(10) *ja* + *glau*	P. 6.1.88
jaglau.	

For the derivation of *mamlau* apply the same rule.

4. According to the *KV*, following Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the rule, the order of derivation should be first the *au*-substitution, then *sthānivadbhāva* is applied, and then reduplication. What the *KV* means is this. At the stage *glā* + *lIṬ* we replace *lIṬ* by *tiP*, and then replace *tiP* by *ṆaL*. That gives us *glā* + *a*. Here we apply *autva* by P. 7.1.34. That give us *glau*. Here *glau* is equal to *glā-* by *sthānivadbhāva*. Then the reduplication rules are applied.

Why that order? The *KV* explains that, after the replacement of the *aupadeśika* element *lIṬ*, *autva* is applied first because it is *anavakāśa* 'not having scope for application.' The reasoning is like this. At the stage *glā* + *a* three rules become applicable simultaneously. They are P. 6.1.101 (*savarṇadīrgha*), which is mentioned as *ekādeśa* 'single substitution,' P. 7.1.34 (*autva*), and P. 6.1.8 (*dvirvacana*). Here the *autva*-rule prevails, because it is a special rule. The *ekādeśa*-rule comes next because it is the *para* 'later' rule in comparison with the reduplication rule P. 6.1.8. Reference is to P. 1.4.2.

Obviously, the order of derivation adopted in the *prakriyā* of *jaglau* shown above is different. The order assumed here after the removal of *aupadeśika* elements is first apply word-building rules (reduplication), then substitution rules. We distinguish three types of substitution rules, (1) those operating on morphemes having a syntactic function, which may be called morphosyntactic substitution rules, (2) those operating on phonemes belonging to morphemes, which may be called morpho-phonemic substitutions, and (3) those operating on meaningless phonemes, which may be called phonemic substitutions. The variety mentioned under (2) comes under *aṅgakāryas*. See Excursus under P. 7.1.17. The order indicated by (1), (2) and (3) is an order of application, in which (3) comes last.

5. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here the order of rule-application is discussed. See under 4, above.

7.1.35 TUHYOS TĀTAṄ ĀŚIṢY ANYATARASYĀM '*tātAṄ* (comes) in place of *tu* or *hi* (after a verbal base *aṅga*) without implying preference, when the question is of benediction'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the non-preferential substitution of the finite verb ending *tāt* for the ending *tu* or *hi* in the case of *āśīrliṅ*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *tuhyoḥ āśiṣi*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Tu* and *hi* are substitutes of *lOṬ* in the sg. 3rd and 2nd person, by P. 3.4.86 and 87. *Āśiṣi* is a special use of *lIṄ* or *lOṬ* mentioned by P. 3.3.173 to express benediction. The *vidheya* is *tātaṅ anyatarasyām*. The *Ṅ* of *tātAṄ* indicates the prohibition of *guṇavṛddhī* by P. 1.1.5. The *tātAṄ* of P. 7.1.35 is not to be confused with the *tāt* of P. 7.1.44, which is a 2nd pl. imperative ending without the value of a benedictive. For the rendering of *anyatarasyām* see Kiparsky 1979, p. 1.

Whitney, § 570, notes that the imperative in *tāt* usually has the value of a 2nd person sg., but sometimes also of other persons and numbers. In § 571 d. he notes that, according to the native grammarians, the imperative in *tāt* has a benedictive implication, but for that he has found no quotable usage. Apparently, the distinction made by Pāṇini between *tātAṄ* and *tāt* has been lost on Whitney.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *jīvatāt bhavān* 'may you live, sir,' *Ijvatāt tvam* 'may you live,' *jīvatu bhavān* 'may you live, sir' and *jīva tvam* 'may you live.' The *prakriyā* of *jīvatāt*, completely explained by the *Nyāsa*, is as follows:

(1)	*jīvA-*		*Dhp.* 1.594
(2)	*jīv*	+ *lOṬ*	P. 3.3.173
(3)	*jīv*	+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*jīv*	+ *ŚaP* + *tiP*	P. 3.1.68
(5)	*jīv*	+ *a* + *tu*	P. 3.4.86
(6)	*jīv*	+ *a* + *tāt*	P. 7.1.35
	jīvatāt.		

Since the *tāt*-replacement is non-preferential, the form *jīvatu* is equally acceptable.

The *prakriyā* of *jīva* is as follows:

(3)	*jīv*	+ *siP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*jīv* + *ŚaP*	+ *si*	P. 3.1.68
(5)	*jīv* + *a*	+ *hi*	P. 3.4.87
(6)	*jīv* + *a*	+ ∘	P. 6.4.105
	jīva.		

4. The *KV* notes that the *N* in *tātAṄ* serves to prohibit *guṇavṛddhī.* Two examples provided by the *Padamañjarī* are *brūtāt* 'may he speak' and *mṛṣṭāt* 'may he clean.' In the first form *guṇa*, applicable by P. 7.3.84, is prohibited, in the second *vṛddhi*, applicable by P. 7.2.115. The implication is that *Ṅ* does not serve to indicate that the substitute *tātAṄ* replaces the final phoneme of the *sthānin* by P. 1.1.53. Therefore, *tāt*, being *anekāl*, replaces the whole of the finite verb ending *tu* by P. 1.1.55.

5. The *KV* notes that the substitute *tātAṄ*, which is *Ṅit*, comes in place of a *sthānin* which is *Pit*. Therefore there is a chance for *tātAṄ* to become *Pit* also, by *sthānivadbhāva*. This is not desired. *TātAṄ* is not itself *Pit*, precisely because it

is *Ṅit*. What is *Ṅit* does not become *Pit*. Therefore, in *brūtād bhavān* 'may you speak, sir' the augment *īṬ* by P. 7.3.93 is not applied. This rule says that *īṬ* is prefixed to a *Pit sārvadhātuka* ending beginning with a consonant when added after *brū-*. But since *tāt* is not *Pit*, *īṬ* is not available, and we can prevent the form **bravītāt*.

6. To point out the significance of the word *āśiṣi* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *grāmaṃ gacchatu bhavān* 'you must go to the village, sir' and *gaccha tvam* 'you must go.' Here *āśīrloṭ* is not used, but *lOṬ* in the sense of *vidhi* 'command,' by P. 3.3.162.

7. The *KV* then quotes two tersely formulated *kārikās*. They are not dealt with by the *Nyāsa*. The *Padamañjarī* says that they are found in some manuscripts. They are included in the Hyderabad edition of the *KV*.

The translation (mainly following the one given by Chandra Vasu, Vol. II, p. 1330) is as follows :

'let *Ṅittva* in *tātAṄ* be the cause of a prohibition of *guṇavṛddhī* . If (it is objected that *Ṅittva* is indicative of an) *antyavidhi* "a rule which applies to the last phoneme (only)," (by P. 1.1.53) (then we say) this is not so. If *anuvṛtti* of *hi* (is assumed in P. 6.4.105 from P. 6.4.101), (then) the *anuvṛtti* of *hi* (in P. 6.4.105) gives us a clue regarding the *lopa*-rule (P. 6.4.105) (namely, that the deletion does not apply to the *tātAṄ*-replacement of *hi*). On the strength of the *Ṅittva* of *tātAṄ* tradition assumes that this (*Ṅ*) is not (indicative of) an *antyavidhi*. This (*Ṅittva*) is not like that of *anAṄ*, etc. (P. 7.1.93-94). Therefore these (substitutes, *anAṄ*, etc.) do give rise to a change of the final phoneme (of a nominal *aṅga*).'

The idea of the *kārikā* is that we have two words *hi* in P. 6.4.105, one continued from P. 6.4.101, and one stated in the rule itself. *Heḥ heḥ* means 'in the place of that *hi* which is the original *hi*,' and not the *hi* which is replaced by *tātAṄ*. The *kārikā* wrongly assumes that *hi-tva* 'the (phonological) property of being *hi*' can be transferred from the *sthānin* to the substitute *tātAṄ*. This goes against P. 1.1.55, *analvidhau*. See P. 7.1.33, under 3. Therefore P. 6.4.105 cannot become applicable for the deletion of *tātAṄ* at all, and the clue referred to in the *kārikā* falls through. Furthermore, the *kārikā* cannot explain why P. 1.1.55 is not prevailed over by P. 1.1.53, the latter rule being an *apavāda* to the former. The actual reason is that the application of P. 1.1.53 would result in endings like *t-tāt* and *h-tāt* where the final phonemes of *tu* and *hi* have been replaced by *tāt*. In these forms the element *tāt* would be meaningless, because now *t-tāt* and *h-tāt* would convey the meaning of *āśiṣ*. But. P. 7.1.35 assigns the meaning *āśiṣ* to *tāt*, not to *t-tāt* or *h-tāt*. Therefore

there can be no question of *antya-ādeśa* by P. 1.1.53. This shows that the purpose of the *anubandha* *Ṅ* must be sought differently, namely, in prohibiting *guṇavṛddhī*.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.36 VIDEḤ ŚATUR VASUḤ '*vasU* (comes) in place of *ŚatṚ* after (the verbal base *aṅga*) *vid-* "to know" '

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *vasU* for the suffix *ŚatṚ* after *vid-*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *videḥ śatuḥ*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Vid-* is the verbal base mentioned as *vidA-* in *Dhp.* 2.55. *Videḥ* is a technical ablative (by P. 1.1.67) formed from the quotation form *vidI* (*Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108). *ŚatṚ* is a participle suffix substitute for *lAṬ* by P. 3.2.124. It is a *sārvadhātuka* suffix. Therefore the augment *iṬ* (P. 7.2.35) is not added. *Śatuḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. It discontinues *tuhyoḥ* from P. 7.1.35. The *vidheya* is *vasuḥ*. *KvasU* is introduced as a participle suffix substitute for *lIṬ* in *chandas* by P. 3.2.107. The suffix *vasU* is a *sārvadhātuka* suffix by *sthānivadbhāva*. Being an *apit sārvadhātuka* suffix it is *Ṅit* by P. 1.2.4. Therefore *guṇavṛddhī* is prohibited by P. 1.1.5. *Vasuḥ* discontinues *tātAṄ* from P. 7.1.35. Since *vasU* is *ugit* 'having *U* as an it-sound,' the augment *nUM* is applicable before *sarvanāmasthāna* endings by P. 7.1.70.

The option word *anyatarasyām* from P. 7.1.35 is discontinued by *FANU*, convention 24, p. 272.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *vidvān* 'one who knows,' *vidvāṃsau* 'the two who know' and *vidvāṃsaḥ* 'those who know.' The derivation of *vidvān* is as follows :

(1)	*vidA-*				*Dhp.* 2.55
(2)	*vid*		+ *lAṬ*		P. 3.2.123
(3)	*vid*		+ *ŚatṚ*		P. 3.2.124
(4)	*vid*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *at*		P. 3.1.68
(5)	*vid*	+ °	+ *at*		P. 2.4.72; *at* is *Ṅit* by P. 3.4.113; 1.2.4; 1.1.5
(6)	*vid*		+ *vasU*		P. 7.1.36
(8)	*vid*		+ *vas*	+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(9)	*vid*	+	*va-nUM-s*	+ *s*	P. 7.1.70
(10)	*vid*	+	*vāns*	+ *s*	P. 6.4.14

(11) *vid* + *vāns* + ° P. 6.1.68
(12) *vid* + *vān*° P. 8.2.23
vidvān.

4. The *KV* notes that, given the *ugit*-operation (P. 7.1.70) on account of *sthānivadbhāva* between *ŚatṚ* and *vasU*, the mention of *vasU* is meant as a general designation to include *KvasU* in P. 6.4.131 also. The *pbh. ekānubandhakagrahaṇe na dvyanubandhakasya* 'when mention is of (a form) having one *anubandha*, there is no mention of (the form) having two *anubandhas*' (see *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. 22, no. 46, under *Vyāḍikṛtaparibhāṣāsūcanam*) is not applicable. This being so, the addition of the *U* (in *vasU*) is redundant.

5. As noted by the *KV*, according to some grammarians (*kecit*, as a term of disapproval, see P. 7.1.30, under 5), the word *anyatarasyām* is continued in the present rule from P. 7.1.35. Thus the forms *vidan* 'one who knows,' *vidantau* 'the two who know' and *vidantaḥ* 'those who know' are justifiable also. But *anyatarasyām* cannot be continued in P. 7.1.36 because its *vidheya* is different from that of P. 7.1.35. See under 2, above.

6. We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It briefly quotes the rule on which it comments and says that the suffix *vasU* added after *vid-* should be provided with the *anubandha K*. The point is that *saṃprasāraṇa* has been prescribed for *vasU* by P. 6.4.131. But *saṃprasāraṇa* is also desired in connection with the *KvasU* prescribed by P. 3.2.107. Now, if it is accepted that a suffix having two *anubandhas* is not the same as the same suffix having one *anubandha*, we cannot apply *saṃprasāraṇa* before *KvasU*. So, Kātyāyana reasons, *KvasU* in P. 3.2.107, and *vasU* in P. 7.1.35 should have an equal number of *anubandhas*, namely, two.

Patañjali rejects the *Vt.* by assuming that *s* is to be read twice, namely, on account of the *saṃhitāpāṭha* reading of P. 7.1.36 and 37 as *videḥ śatur vasus samāse 'anañpūrve ktvo lyap*. Here *vasus*, understood as *vasUS*, does have two *anubandhas*.

Therefore the *pbh.* mentioned under 4, above, is not applicable, and we can manage by the rule as stated. This must have been one of Patañjali's less fortunate brain waves.

7.1.37 SAMĀSE 'NAÑPŪRVE KTVO LYAP 'given a compound in which *naÑ* does not come first, *LyaP* (comes) in place of *Ktvā* (added after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of the suffix *LyaP* in place of *Ktvā* added after a verbal base *aṅga* on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt*) *samāse anañpūrve ktvaḥ*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Aṅgāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. For *samāse* and *anañpūrve* see below. *Ktvaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. The actual suffix is *Ktvā*. It forms absolutives in the sense prescribed by P. 3.4.21. The *vidheya* is *LyaP*. The *anubandha L* is added to indicate *udātta* of the preceding syllable by P. 6.1.193. The *anubandha P* is not strictly required here for accent (*anudātta*, P. 3.1.4), but is mainly added to trigger off the addition of the augment *tUK* to a verbal base ending in a short vowel by P. 6.1.71.

As a technical designation *samāsa* is defined by enumeration. It applies to the formations prescribed in the section P. 2.1.3 to P. 2.2.38. In the present rule *samāsa* is used to cover formations like *prakṛtya* 'after having accomplished' and *akṛtvā* 'after not having done.' The traditional derivation of *prakṛtya* has been stated in *AP* IV, P. 1.4.60, under 5. The form *samāse* itself is taken as a *viṣayasaptamī*.

Anañpūrve is a *bv.* cp. qualifying *samāse*. It literally means 'that of which the first member is other than *naÑ*.' Reference is to that form in which the *Ktvānta* form comes second. Thereby forms like *aprakṛtya* are excluded. The *anubandha Ñ* is added to *na* for the sake of *svarūpanirdhāraṇa* 'specification of its own form.' The *n* of *na* is deleted by P. 6.3.73 when *naÑ* is the first member of a cp. The form *anañsamāse* is used in P. 6.1.132. Here it refers to a cp.-formation (by P. 2.2.6) of *na* with pronominal stems, like in *aneṣaḥ* 'not this one' (P. 6.3.73).

3. *Prakṛtya* and *akṛtvā* differ technically in the sense that in *prakṛtya* the *upasarga pra* receives the name *gati* by P. 1.4.60, given connection with an action, whereas in *akṛtvā* the negative particle *naÑ* is called *avyaya* (no. 32 in Böhtlingk's edition of the *svarādigaṇa*), but not *gati*. Moreover, the question of a semantic difference may be raised. It seems fairly obvious that in *akṛtvā* the negative particle is added to *kṛtvā*. First derive *kṛtvā*, then add *naÑ*. But in the derivation of *prakṛtya* do we first combine *pra* and *kṛ-*, and then add *Ktvā*, or do we follow the pattern of *akṛtvā*? Actually, the question is phrased in the wrong way. In the derivation of *prakṛtya* we do not first combine *pra* and *kṛ-*, for which there is no Pāṇini-rule anyway. Then what would be the *prakriyā* of *prakṛtya*? We assume it to be as follows :

(1) *pra* + (*kṛ-* + *Ktvā*)

This is a sequence of three forms in which *pra* figures as an underivable independent form, and in which *kr-* and *Ktvā* are linguistic elements, like in the *padasaṃskārapakṣa* (see *VIBHA*, Introduction, p. i-ii. iv-v). For *kṛ-* we refer to *Dhp.* 8.10, for *Ktvā* to P. 3.4.21.

(2) *prakṛtvā*	P. 2.2.18
(3) *prakṛya*	P. 7.1.37 (*samāse*)
(4) *prakṛ* + *tUK* + *ya*	P. 6.1.71
prakṛtya.	

For *pra* as an independent word see under Excursus, below.

The *prakriyā* of *akṛtvā* provides another difficulty.

(1)	*ḌUkṛÑ-*	*Dhp.* 8.10
(2)	*kṛ* + *Ktvā*	P. 3.4.21
(3)	(*naÑ* + *sU*) + (*kṛtvā* + *sU*) + *sU*	P. 2.3.46 (for the addition of *sU*); 2.2.6

The application of P. 2.2.6 for cp.-formation here is doubtful, to say the least. This rule is applied to form a *tp.* cp., when the *uttarapada* is a case-inflected word. But in the present case the question is of a cp. -formation involving two *avyayas* to which a case ending is added for the sake of uniformity of derivation. The other possibly applicable rule is P. 2.2.22 which allows *upapada tp.* cp.-formation with a *Ktvānta* form. One example is *uccaiḥkṛtya*. *Upapadas* are of two types, representing a *kāraka*, and representing a *gati*. But *naÑ* is neither.

(4) (*na* + °) + (*kṛtvā* + °) + *sU*		P. 2.4.71
(5) *nakṛtvā*	+ °	P. 2.4.82
(6) *akṛtvā*		P. 6.3.73
akṛtvā.		

The conclusion is that, even if we can account for *prakṛtya*, the cp. formation *akṛtvā* is not derivable in the A. What holds for *akṛtvā* holds equally for a form like *akartum*, used by Patañjali on many occasions.

EXCURSUS on semantic connection with a verbal base, on *upasargas* and on cp.-formation.

(1) P. 3.4.21 says that *Ktvā* is added after a verbal base on two conditions. This rule comes under the *adhikāra* rule P. 3.4.1 which states that the suffixes mentioned in the sequel are added when there is a semantic connection between two verbal bases (*dhātusaṃbandhe*). One example is *bhuktvā vrajati* 'after having eaten he goes.'

(2) In *ghaṭaṃ karoti* 'he makes a jar' and *vijitya* 'after having conquered' the semantic connection of *ghata* and *vi* is with the action expressed by the verbal bases concerned rather than with *karoti* and *jitvā* where subsequently *tvā* is replaced by *ya*. For *upasargas* we refer to P. 1.4.59, which states the condition *kriyāyoge* 'given connection with an action.'

(3) Although in Sanskrit *upasargas* are written together with the following verbform, they are separate words having an accent of their own. The following verbform is unaccented by P. 8.1.28. Tradition assumes that between a preverb and a verb sandhi (*saṃhitā*) is invariably applicable: *saṃhitaikapade nityā nityā dhātūpasargayoḥ* (part of a *śloka* quoted by *SK*, No. 2232 on P. 8.4.18).

Between an *upasarga* and a verb form there is a close semantic connection in the sense that the *upasarga* modifies the verbal base meaning. Examples are *vi* + *kṛ-*, and *ā* + *dā-*. But in Pāṇinian grammar the combination of an *upasarga* with a verbal base never receives the designation *dhātu*. Moreover, the close semantic connection does not result in an inseparable morphological connection, as is shown by the fact that in Sanskrit the augment of tense and reduplication are added directly to the verbal base, never mind the *upasarga*. See further Whitney, §§ 585, 589, 1076, 1082-1086.

(4) At least four different types of semantic combinations involving a verbal base can be distinguished: (1) *ā* + *dhā* , P. 1.4.59, (2) *dhā* + *Ktvā*, P.3.4.21, (3) *a* + *dhātvā*, not acknowledged in the A., and (4) *an* + *ādhatvā*, not acknowledged in the A.

(5) All cps are derived by combining case-inflected words, or by combining a case-inflected word with a *kṛdanta* form before it becomes a case-inflected word. Reference is to P. 2.1.2-4 and to *PN*, *pbh*. 75.

(6) There is no rule in the *samāsa* section which specifically prescribes cp.-formation of *naÑ* with a *kṛdanta* word.

End of Excursus

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *prakṛtya* 'after having accomplished,' *prahṛtya* 'after having struck,' *pārśvataḥkṛtya* 'after having turned sideways,' *nānākṛtya* 'after having made manifold' and *dvidhākṛtya* 'after having made twofold.' The *Nyāsa* notes that in *pārśvataḥkṛtya* the suffix *Ktvā* is added by P. 3.4.61 and that cp.-formation is by P. 2.2.21. In *nānākṛtya* the suffix *Ktvā* is added by P. 3.4.62 and cp.-formation is again by P. 2.2.21.The same holds for *dvidhākṛtya*.

5. To point out the significance of the word *samāse* in the rule, the *KV* mentions the counterexamples *krtvā* 'after having done' and *hṛtvā* 'after having seized.'

To point out the significance of the word *anañpūrve* in the rule, the *KV* mentions the counterexamples *akṛtvā* 'after not having done,' *ahṛtvā* 'after not having seized,' *paramakṛtvā* 'after having done in one's best way' and *uttamakṛtvā* 'after having done in one's best way.' The examples have been borrowed from the *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. VII on the present rule (*Mbh*. III, p. 255, lines 24 and 25). Here *parama* and *uttama* are taken as adverbs, not as action-dependent nouns.

How can *paramakṛtvā* and *uttamakṛtvā* come under *samāse* and *anaÑ*? As regards the first question, the *Nyāsa* refers to P. 2.1.61. As regards the second question, the *KV*, referring to the *bhāṣya* on *Vt*. VII on the present rule, explains that *anaÑ* means *naño 'nyad* 'other than *naÑ*.' The text of the Varanasi and Hyderabad editions which read *nañā anyad* is to be emended. 'Other than *naÑ*' again is interpreted to mean *nañ iva* 'similar to *naÑ*.' But what is meant by 'similar to *naÑ*'? It means any word which is other than *naÑ* but which is not an *avyaya*. Therefore *parama* and *uttama* can come under *anaÑ*.

The *Nyāsa* explains that in *akṛtvā* and *ahṛtvā* the condition *anañpūrve* is not met. Therefore *Ktvā* is not replaced by *LyaP*. But what about *paramakṛtvā* and *uttamakṛtvā*? How is cp.-formation by P. 2.1.61 here at all possible, the *Nyāsa* asks. The assumption is that between *parama / uttama* on the one hand, and *kṛtvā* on the other, there is no *sāmānādhikaraṇya* 'reference to one and the same item,' as required by P. 2.1.49 (continued in P. 2.1.61). Still, one might try to defend *sāmānādhikaraṇya* by saying that *Ktvā* has been prescribed in the sense of agent, and that this agent is qualified by the words *parama* and *uttama* as words with nominative case endings. One wonders what the cps could mean in that case. However, if *parama* and *uttama* are taken as adverbs, there is no *sāmānādhikaraṇya*. Then how to justify cp. formation here? That is why the *Nyāsa* has recourse to the word *bahulam* in P. 2.1.57. Any way these are not convincing counterexamples.

6. Referring to *Vt.* IV on the present rule the *KV* says that in the cps *snātvākālaka*, etc. mentioned in the *mayūravyaṃsakādi-gaṇa* (P. 2.1.72) *Ktvā* is not replaced by *LyaP* because the cps listed here are regarded as *nipātanas*. See further under 9, below, *Vt.* IV.

7. Then, following the discussion in the *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* VII on the present rule, the *KV* comes up with another idea regarding the word *samāse* in the rule. Suppose that it is a *nirdhāraṇasaptamī* 'loc. case ending in the sense of setting apart.' The use of a *nirdhāraṇasaptamī* is attested in the *KV* on P. 2.3.41, in the example *manuṣyāṇām / manuṣyeṣu kṣatriyaḥ śūratamaḥ* 'among men the *kṣatriya* is the most courageous one.' The idea is that among *anañpūrva samāsa* the *ktvānta samāsa* forms a separate group. That is done by taking *samāse* in P. 7.1.37 as a *nirdhāraṇasaptamī*. Thereby the cp.- formation meant by P. 7.1.37 becomes restricted to cp.-formations with a compound ending *in ktvā* only. In other words, *samāse* is taken to mean *ktvānte samāse* 'given a compound which ends in *Ktvā*.'

How to arrive at *ktvānta*? By applying the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72), or rather *PN*, *pbh.* 23, to *ktvaḥ*. From *aṅgāt*, continued in P. 7.1.37, we understand *aṅgāt uttarasya pratyayasya* 'in place of the suffix (*Ktvā*) which follows after an *aṅga*).' Here the application of the *tadantavidhi* results in the interpretation of *ktvaḥ* as *ktvāntasya*. This should not be taken to mean that *LyaP* comes in place of the *ktvānta* word as a whole. *PN*, *pbh.* 12, tells us that substitution is of that element only which is directly stated in the rule. In our case, that element is *Ktvā*.

But why not apply the *kṛdgrahaṇe-pbh.* (*PN*, *pbh.* 28)? This is the question discussed by Patañjali in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* VII. The *pbh.* says that when the mention of a *kṛt* suffix is interpreted (by *PN*, *pbh.* 23) to refer to a wordform ending with that suffix, the *kṛt* suffix concerned is understood to stand for that wordform along with a *gati* or action-dependent noun (*kāraka*). The reason, as explained by the *Nyāsa*, is that by this *pbh.* we cannot justify the formation of cps like *nānākṛtya* 'after having made manifold' and *dvidhākṛtya* 'after having made two-fold,' both by P. 3.4.62, because *nānā* and *dvidhā* are neither a *gati*, nor a *kāraka*. The non-applicability of *PN*, *pbh.* 28 is also suggested by the mention of the word *anañpūrve* in P. 7.1.37. If this rule is interpreted to mean *ktvānte samāse*, and if the *ktvānta* cp. is preceded by a *gati* or by a *kāraka* on the basis of *pbh.* 28, the rule cannot possibly apply to a *ktvānta* form preceded by *naÑ* which is neither *gati* nor *kāraka*. Therefore *anañpūrve* gives us the clue that *PN*, *pbh.* 28 is not to be applied in the present case.

8. Finally, the *KV*, referring to *Vts.* II and III on the present rule, says that in forms like *pradhāya* 'after having placed before' and *prasthāya* 'after having set

out' (examples borrowed from Patañjali) the *LyaP*-operation, which is *bahiraṅga*, definitely blocks even the *antaraṅga* rules beginning with the *hi*-substitution rule (for *dhā*-, P. 7.4.42). See further under 9, *Vt*. III. Compare also *PN*, *pbh*. 54.

9. We have seven *Vts* on the rule. *Vt* I says that when the question is of *LyaP*-substitution, a statement regarding *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like an element belonging to the *upadeśa*' should be made. By *upadeśa* Pāṇini's original formulations as stated in the *Sūtrapāṭha*, *Dhātupāṭha* and *Gaṇapāṭha* are meant. This excludes substitutions applied in the course of the *prakriyā* later on. Since by *Vt*. I *LyaP* is regarded as an *upadeśa*-element, it is introduced first in the *prakriyā*, along with possible other *aupadeśika* elements. The purpose of *Vt*. I is explained by *Vt*. II.

Vt. II says that *upadeśivadbhāva* is for the sake of *anādiṣṭa* '(forms) in which substitution is not applied.' *Ādiṣṭa* means *ādeśa* 'substitution.' The form *ādiṣṭa* is derived by P. 3.3.114, whereas *ādeśa* is derived by P. 3.3.18. *Anādiṣṭa* is a *bv*. cp. Patañjali sums up nine instances, stated as *hitva-dattva-āttva-itva-ītva-dīrghatva-ś-ūṭh-it*. Reference is to P. 7.4.42; 7.4.46; 6.4.42; 7.4.40; 6.4.66; 6.4.15; 6.4.19 (twice), and 7.2.56 successively. In all these cases *LyaP* is applied first, and the substitutions mentioned are not applied. Patañjali quotes examples for each and every case. Two such examples are *pradhāya* and *prasthāya*. Here the *hi*-substitution, applied in the non-cp. form *hitvā* and the *i*-substitution, applied in the non-cp. form *sthitvā* (P. 7.4.40), are not applied.

This is precisely what the *siddha*-principle tells us. In all these cases the *LyaP*-substitution destroys the *nimitta* of the other substitutions. Therefore it is applied first.

Vt. III states the reason for the prescription of *upadeśivadbhāva*. The *LyaP*-substitution is *bahiraṅga* in relation to the other substitutions.Therefore it should be applied after the other substitutions have taken place. Still, it must be applied before the other substitutions. In the forms quoted the substitution of *hi* for *dhā*- and the substitution of *ī* for the long *ā* of *sthā*- (as applied in *sthīyate*, P. 6.4.66) is not applied, although both are *antaraṅga* in relation to the *LyaP*-substitution. Thereby Kātyāyana makes it clear that in the case of the *LyaP*-substitution is *aupadeśika*, and, therefore, even if it is *bahiraṅga*, it prevails over *antaraṅga* operations. The same has been stated in different words by *PN*, *pbh*. 54. The clue for this *pbh*. is found in P. 2.4.36.

Actually, the *pbh.* is not required. See *AP* IV, p. 68-69, where it is argued that the *siddha*-principle can take care of the desired forms.

Vt. IV says that a prohibition of the *LyaP*-substitution should be phrased for the cps *snātvākālaka*, etc. As explained by Patañjali, the question is of three cps, *snātvākālaka* 'after having taken bath, (still) black,' *pītvāsthiraka* 'after having taken drink, (still) steady (on his feet)' and *bhuktvāsuhitaka* 'after having taken a meal, (still) not satisfied.' The latter cp. is dissolved as *bhuktvā* + *asuhitaka* in order to conform to the meaning-pattern of the first two cps. *Snātvākālaka*, etc. are included in the *mayūravyaṃsakādi-gaṇa* (nos 45-47 in Böhtlingk's edition of the *gaṇapaṭha* on P. 2.1.72). Since the three cps mentioned are not *ktvānta* cp.-formations, it is difficult to see how P. 7.1.37 could become applicable at all. That is pointed out by *Vt.* V.

Vt. V says that we can manage by the mention of *tadanta* '(a cp.) ending in that (*ktvā*).' See under 7, above.

Vt. VI proposes a different solution. It says that the three cps mentioned should be listed as *nipātanas*. Reference is to the *gaṇa* on P. 2.1.72 where, in fact, the cps have been listed, presumably on Kātyāyan's authority.

Vt. VII proposes still another idea. It says that the rule should be phrased as *anañaḥ parasya* '(*LyaP* comes) in place of (*Ktvā*) which follows after what is other than *naÑ*.' If that rephrasing is accepted, the three cps mentioned can be justified. *AnaÑ* means what is different from, but at the same time similar to *naÑ*. See *PN*, *pbh.* 74. Thus *anañpūrva* is interpreted to refer to a *ktvānta* form which is preceded by an *anaÑ* word, any word which is other than *naÑ*. Since in *snātvākālaka*, etc., the *ktvānta* form is not preceded by any word other than *naÑ*, the *LyaP*-substitition is prohibited.

Patañjali in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* VII first discusses the meaning of *anaÑ* by referring to what has become *PN*, *pbh.* 74. Then he discusses the question which *pbh.* out of the *pratyayagrahaṇa-pbh.* (*PN*, *pbh.* 23) and the *kṛdgrahaṇa-pbh.* (*PN*, *pbh.* 28) is is to be applied. For the argument see under 7, above. Patañjali's conclusion is that the mention of *anañpūrve* gives us the clue that only the *pratyayagrahaṇa-pbh.* can be applied to P. 7.1.37. The reason is that, if the other *pbh.* was meant to be applicable, the word *anañpūrve* would be redundant. Even without this word in the rule we could derive what is desired, like *prakṛtya*, and prohibit what is not desired, like **akṛtya*.

The discussion is summed up in a *kārika* consisting of two *ślokas*, at the end of the *bhāṣya*.

7.1.38 KTVĀPI CHANDASI 'in the Vedic language (given a cp. in which *naÑ* does not come first) *Ktvā* also (comes in place of *ktvā* added after a a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a peculiarity of the Vedic language.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt samāse anañpūrve ktvaḥ*) *chandasi*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. The rest of the *uddeśya* within brackets is continued from P. 7.1.37. For *chandasi* see P. 7.1.8, under 2. The *vidheya* is *ktvāpi*. For the character of the rule see *AP* IX, P. 6.4.58, under 1.

By saying *ktvāpi* the rule accepts *ktvā* as a substitute of *Ktvā*. In fact, in the Vedic language, *ktvā* may or may not be replaced by *LyaP* on the condition stated.

3. The examples for *Ktvā* quoted by the *KV* are *kṛṣṇaṃ vāso yajamānaṃ paridhāpayitvā* 'after having caused the *yajamāna* to put on a dark cloth' (*Kāth. S.* 11.10) and *pratyañcam arkam pratyarpitvā* 'after having offered a water oblation to the setting sun' (Ath.V. 2.12.55). The example quoted for *LyaP* is *uddhṛtya juhoti* 'having raised up, he offers' (*Kāth. S.* 6.8).

The *Nyāsa* explains that in *paridhāpayitvā* the augment *pUK* has been aplied by P. 7.3.36, and that in *uddhṛtya* the *h* of *hṛ-* has been replaced by *dh* by P. 8.4.62.

4. Why hasn't the rule been phrased as *vā chandasi* 'optionally in the Vedic language'? According to the *KV*, this has not been done in order to indicate that all restrictive conditions on the use of *Ktvā* have been relaxed in the Vedic language. Therefore *LyaP* may be found even when there is no compound, like in *arcya tān devān gataḥ* 'after having worshipped the gods, he has gone away.' The source of the quotation is not known.

5. The *KV* notes that the word *chandas* is continued up to P. 7.1.50, inclusive.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.39 SUPĀṂ SU-LUK-PŪRVASAVARṆA-Ā-ĀT-ŚE-YĀ-ḌĀ-ḌYĀ-YĀC-ĀL-AḤ '(in the Vedic language) *sU*, *luk*(-deletion), (substitution of) a sound belonging to the same class as the preceding one, *ā*, *āt*, *Śe*, *yā*, *Ḍā*, *Ḍyā*, *yāC*, and *āL* (come) in place of (the endings called) *sUP* (added after a nominal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting peculiarities of the Vedic language.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgāt chandasi*) *supām*. Here *aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *SUP* is the collective name for the case endings introduced by P. 4.1.2. *Supām* is a technical genitive by P. 1.1.49. It discontinues *ktvaḥ* from P. 7.1.37. The *vidheya* is *sU-luk-pūrvasavarṇa-ā-āt-Śe-yā-Ḍā-Ḍyā-yāC-āL-aḥ*, where *ā-āt-Śe* appears as *ācche*. Reference is to various substitutes for the case endings mentioned as *sUP*. Thereby *LyaP* from P. 7.1.37 is discontinued. To determine what is *pūrvasavarṇa*, P. 1.1.50 is applied.

3. We note that the Vedic case endings mentioned in the rule are treated as substitutes of the Sanskrit case endings which are assumed to be the regular ones. We also note that the *anubandhas* added have functions defined in the A. See further Kiparsky 1979, p, 56-57.

4. The *KV* quotes the following examples :

(1) For *sU* :

anukṣarā ṛjavaḥ santu panthāḥ 'may (your) paths be without thorns and straight' (RgV. 10. 85.23). Here *panthāḥ*, which is a sg. formed with *sU*, is used for what in Sanskrit should be *panthānaḥ*, a plural formed with *Jas*, as explained by the *Nyāsa*.

The *KV* then quotes a *Bhāṣyavārttika* as *supāṃ supo bhavanti* '*sUP* endings are used in place of (other) *sUP* (endings).' For a slightly different text see *Mbh.* III, p. 256, line 13. The example, borrowed in part from Patañjali, is *dhuri dakṣiṇāyāḥ* '(the mother was yoked) in the yoke of Dakṣiṇā' (RgV. 1.164.9). According to Patañjali, here *dakṣiṇāyāḥ* is used for what in Sanskrit should be *dakṣiṇāyām*. But, if the translation (see K.F. Geldner, Vol. I, p. 229) is correct, Patañjali is wrong.

The *KV* then quotes another *Bhāṣyavārttika* as *tiṅāṃ tiṅo bhavanti* 'finite verb endings are used in place of (other) finite verb endings.' For a slightly different text see *Mbh.* III, p. 256, line 14. The example, borrowed from Patañjali, is *caṣālaṃ ye aśvayūpāya takṣati* '(those) who fashion the wooden ring for the post to which

the sacrificial horse is bound' (ṚgV. 1.162.6). Here *takṣati* is used for what in Sanskrit should be *takṣanti*.

(2) For *luk*-deletion :

ārdre carman 'on a wet skin' (*Taitt. S.* 1.5.9.3) and *rohite carman* 'on a red skin' (*Kāṭhaka S.* 24.2), for what in Sanskrit should be *carmaṇi*. The *luk*-deletion is of the loc. case ending, as noted by the *Nyāsa*. Patañjali's idea of bringing the examples under *pūrvasavarṇa* is wrong, because it involves an order of application of rules which goes against P. 8.2.8.

havirdhāne yat sunvati tat sāmidhenīr anvāha 'with regard to the oblation-receptacle in which he presses, one subsequently recites the *sāmidhenī* verses' (?) (source unknown). Here *yad...tad* are used for what in Sanskrit should be *yasmin ...tasmin*.

(3) For *pūrvasavarṇa* :

dhītī 'by means of thought' (RgV. 1.164.8), *matī* 'by means of (using) the brain' (source unknown), *suṣṭutī* 'by means of an excellent hymn' (ṚgV. 2.32.4), for what in Sanskrit should be *dhītyā*, *matyā* and *suṣṭutyā*.

(4) For *ā* :

dvā yantāra 'the two drivers' (*Taitt. S.* 4.6.9.3), for what in Sanskrit should be *dvau yantārau*. The Benares ed. of the *KV* reads *ubhā* 'both' instead of *dvā* of the Hyderabad ed.

(5) For *āt* :

na tād brāhmaṇād nindāmi 'I do not blame these brahmins' (source unknown), for what in Sanskrit should be (*na*) *tān brāhmaṇān*.

(6) For *Śe* :

na yuṣme vājabandhavaḥ 'not you (pl. acc.) who share in the booty' (ṚgV. 8.68.19) and *asme indrabṛhaspatī* 'to us, o Indra and Bṛhaspati' (ṚgV. 4.49.4), for what in Sanskrit should be *yūyam* and *vayam*. The substitutions of *yūya* and *vaya* (by P. 7.2.93) are not applied because the forms belong to *chandas*.

The *anubandha Ś* is indicative of *sarvādeśa* (P. 1.1.55), as noted by the *Nyāsa*.

(7) For *yā* :

uruyā 'by the wide one' (*Maitr. S.* 3.7.8) and *dhṛṣṇuyā* 'by a bold one' (source unknown), for what in Sanskrit should be *uruṇā* and *dhṛṣṇunā*.

(8) For *Ḍā* :

nābhā pṛthivyām 'the two navels on the earth' (?) (Ath. V. 7.61.1), for what in Sanskrit should be *nābhau pṛthivyām*. The *Nyāsa* explains that the *anubandha Ḍ* is added for *ṭilopa* (by P. 6.4.143).

(9) For *Ḍyā* :

anuṣṭyā cyāvayatām 'by means of an *anuṣṭubh* they must loosen' (?) (Maitr. S. 4.13.4.25), for what in Sanskrit should be *anustubhā*, a word in the instr. case.

(10) For *yāC* :

sādhuyā 'in the correct way' (ṚgV. 10.66.12), for what in Sanskrit should be *sādhu*. Here the sg. nom. case ending *sU* is replaced by *yā*, instead of by *luk*, accord-ing to P. 7.1.23, as noted by the *Nyāsa*. The *anubandha C* is added for ensuring the *udātta* accent (by P. 6.1.163).

(11) For *āL* :

vasantā yajeta 'one should sacrifice during spring' (Maitr. S. 2.3.4), for what in Sanskrit should be *vasante*. The *anubandha L* is indicative of the *udātta* accent of the preceding syllable (by P. 6.1.193), as noted by the *Nyāsa*.

5. The *KV* then quotes *Vt*. I on the present rule, and a *Bhāṣyavārttika*, for which see below, under 6.

6. We have one *Vt*. on the rule. It says that inclusion should be made of *iyā*, *ḌiyāC*, and long *ī*. Patañjali quotes the following examples :

(1) For *iyā*

urviyā pari khan 'they look around widely' (ṚgV. 10.10.2), *dārviyā parijman* 'with wood all around' (?) (source unknown), for what in Sanskrit should be *uruṇā* and *dāruṇā*.

(2) For *ḌiyāC*

sukṣetriyā sugātuyā 'out of desire for good fields, out of desire for prosperity' (ṚgV. 1.97.2), for what in Sanskrit should be *sukṣetriṇā sugātriṇā*. For the function of the *anubandha Ḍ* see under 4 (8), above. For the function of the *anubandha* C see under 4 (10), above.

(3) For long *ī*

dṛtiṃ na suṣkaṃ sarasī śayānaṃ 'lying (sg. acc.) shrivelled like a leather bag in a pond' (ṚgV. 7.103.2), for what in Sanskrit should be *sarasi śayānaṃ*.

7. In addition, Patañjali phrases a *Bhāṣyavārttika*. It says that *āṄ*, *ayāC* and *ayāR* are to be included. Patañjali quotes the following examples:

(1) For *āṄ*:

pra bāhavā '(stretches) out with the arm' (ṚgV. 2.38.2), for what in Sanskrit should be *pra bāhunā*. The *anubandha* Ṅ makes the *ā Ṅit*, so that *guṇa* can be applied by P. 7.3.111, as noted by the *Nyāsa*.

(2) For *ayāC*:

svapnayā sacase janaṃ 'you associate with people by means of a dream' (Ath.V. 5.7.8), for what in Sanskrit should be *svapnena*. For the function of the *anubandha* C see under 4.(10), above.

(3) For *ayāR*:

sa naḥ sindhum iva nāvayā '(bring) us like with a ship over a river' (ṚgV. 1.97.8), for what in Sanskrit should be *nāvā*. The *anubandha R* serves to ensure the *udātta* accent of the penultimate syllable by P. 6.1.127, as noted by the *Nyāsa*.

7.1.40 AMO MAŚ '(in the Vedic language) *mAŚ* (comes) in place of *am* (after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*) *amaḥ*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Amaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Am* is the first person sg. ending, which is itself the substitute of *miP* in the case of *Ṅit lakāras* by P. 3.4.101. It discontinues *supām* from P. 7.1.39. The *vidheya* is *mAŚ*. It discontinues the whole of *suluk*, etc. from P. 7.1.39. The function of the *anubandha Ś* is defined by P. 1.1.55.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* (for *lUṄ*) are *vadhīṃ vṛtram* 'I killed Vrtra' (ṚgV. 1.165.8) and *kramīṃ vṛkṣasya śākhām* 'I climbed a branch of the tree' (source unknown). The *KV* explains that in the case of *lUṄ* the tense augment *aṬ* (by P. 6.4.71) is not added because of P. 6.4.75, which is a *chandas* rule containing the word *bahulam* 'variously.'

The derivation of *vadhīm*, for which there is a detailed statement in the *Nyāsa*, is as follows:

(1)	*han-*				*Dhp.* 2.2
(2)	*han*			+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110; *aḍāgama* is not added, P. 6.4.75
(3)	*han*			+ *miP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*vadha*			+ *miP*	P. 2.4.43
(5)	*vadha*	+ *Cl*		+ *miP*	P. 3.1.43
(6)	*vadh°*	+ *Cl*		+ *mi*	P. 6.4.48
(7)	*vadh*	+ *Cl*		+ *am*	P. 3.4.101
(8)	*vadh*	+ *sIC*		+ *am*	P. 3.1.44
(9)	*vadh*	+ *sIC*		+ *mAŚ*	P. 7.1.40
(10)	*vadh* + *iṬ*	+ *s*		+ *m*	P. 7.2.35
(11)	*vadh* + *iṬ*	+ *s*	+ *īṬ*	+ *m*	P. 7.3.96 (*aprkte*)
(12)	*vadh* + *i*	+ °	+ *ī*	+ *m*	P. 8.2.28
(13)	*vadh*	+ *ī*		+ *m*	P. 6.1.101
	vadhīm.				

In stage (13) a non-*tripādi* rule is applied after a *tripādi* rule. We refer to *Vt.* V on P. 8.2.6, which says that the deletion of *sIC* is regarded as *siddha*, when the question is of single substitution (by P. 6.1.101).

4. Referring to the discussion in the *bhāṣya* on the present rule, the *KV* finally says that the *anubandha Ś* serves for deleting the *sthānin* as a whole. Otherwise, the *m* of *mAŚ* would replace only the final *m* of *am* by P. 1.1.52. But it may be objected that there is no point in replacing *m* by *m*, so we will understand anyway that the whole of *am* is to be replaced. By way of answer the *KV* says that the statement of *mAŚ* is still purposeful. The reason is that, otherwise, the mention of *m* only might serve to do away with *anusvāra*. If it is accepted that *m* replaces *m* (in *vadhīm*), there is no scope for *anusvāra* any more. This is what happens in *saṃrāṭ*, where *m* is replaced by *m*, by P. 8.3.25. The reason why P.7.1.40 does not prescribe *m* as a single sound substitute, but *sarvādeśa*, as indicated by *Ś*, is precisely to allow *anusvāra*. Consequently, we can justify the text reading *vadhīṃ vṛtram*.

5. We have no *Vt.* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* containing a *Ślokavārttika*. For the main content of the *bhāṣya* see under 4, above.

7.1.41 LOPAS TA ĀTMANEPADEṢU '(in the Vedic language) *lopa* (comes) in place of *t*, (after a verbal base *aṅga*), given *ātmanepada* endings'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the deletion of the phoneme *t* of an *ātm.* ending.

2. The *uddesya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*) *ātmanepadeṣu taḥ*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. The *ātmanepada* endings are introduced by P. 3.4.78. They are added after verbal bases having an *anudātta* vowel or marked with the *anubandha Ṅ*, by P. 1.3.12, and to the verbal bases specifically mentioned in P. 1.3.17-71. *Ātmanepadeṣu* is a *viṣayasaptamī* 'loc. ending indicative of a domain.' *Taḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. The phoneme *t* forms part of several *ātm.* endings. Generally, a substitute comes in place of the final phoneme of the *sthānin*, by P. 1.1.52, but when the question is of a *sthānin* which is prescribed as a following element (here "after a verbal base *aṅga*") the substitute comes in place of the initial phoneme of the following element by P. 1.1.54. *Taḥ* discontinues *amah* from P. 7.1.40. The *vidheya* is *lopaḥ*. *Lopa* means a replacement by zero (P. 1.1.60). A *lopa*-operation is an environment changing operation. Therefore it prevails over other operations. *Lopa* in P. 7.1.41 discontinues *mAŚ* from P. 7.1.40.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *devā aduhra* 'the gods milked' (*Maitr. S.* 4.2.1) and *gandharvāpsaraso aduhra* 'the Gandharvas and the apsarasas milked' (source unknown). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *aduhata*, the 3rd pl.

impf. *ātm.* ending *ata* (substituted for *anta* by P. 7.1.5). Here *t* is deleted by P. 7.1.41, and the augment *rUṬ* is added by P. 7.1.8. Next the *KV* quotes the example *duhām aśvibhyāṃ payo aghnyeyam* 'this (cow) which is not to be killed should give milk for the Aśvins' (ṚgV. 1.164.27). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *dugdhām*, the 3rd sg. imp. *ātm.* The last example is *dakṣiṇata upaśaye* 'he lies down on the right side' (*Kāṭhaka S.* 20.6). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *upaśete*, the 3 sg. pres. *ātm.*

In *aduhra* the augment *rUṬ* is applied by P. 7.1.8. As stated by the *Nyāsa*, the derivation of *dugdhām* is as follows :

(1)	*duh-*			*Dhp.* 2.4
(2)	*duh*		+ *lOṬ*	P. 3.3.162
(3)	*duh*		+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*duh*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *ta*	P. 3.1.68
(5)	*duh*	+ °	+ *ta*	P. 2.4.72
(6)	*duh*		+ *te*	P. 3.4.79
(7)	*duh*		+ *tām*	P. 3.4.90
(8)	*dugh*		+ *tām*	P. 8.2.32
(9)	*dugh*		+ *dhām*	P. 8.2.40
(10)	*dug*		+ *dhām*	P. 8.4.53
	dugdhām.			

In the Vedic form *duhām* the *t* is deleted by P. 7.1.41 in stage (8), and the remaining stages are cancelled.

4. To point out the significance of the *anuvṛtti* of the word *api* from P. 7.1.38, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *ātmānam anṛtaṃ kurute* 'he commits untruth.' The idea of the *KV* is to continue *api* 'also' by *maṇḍūkapluti* in order to justify the form *kurute* where the *t*, in deviation from P. 7.1.41, is not deleted. *Api* practically means 'optionally.'

To point out the significance of the word *ātmanepadeṣu* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *utsaṃ duhanti kalaśaṃ caturbilam* 'they milk the trickling pot with four openings' (*Taitt. Br.* 3.7.4.16). Reference is to a cow's udder. Both the Benares and the critical Hyderabad editions of thr *KV* read *vatsam* instead of *utsam*, which is clearly wrong.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.42 DHVAMO DVHĀT '(in the Vedic language) *dhvāt* (comes) in place of *dhvam* (after a verbal base *aṅga*, given *ātmanepada* endings)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt ātmanepadeṣu*) *dhvamaḥ*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ātmanepadeṣu* is continued from P. 7.1.41, although the *KV* does not say so. *Dhvamaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Dhvam* is the 2nd pl. imp. *ātm.* ending. It discontinues *taḥ* from P. 7.1.41. The *vidheya* is *dhvāt*. It discontinues *lopaḥ* from P. 7.1.41. Since *dhvāt* is *anekāl*, it replaces the whole of *dhvam* by P. 1.1.55. According to Whitney, § 571 d, the use of *dhvāt* is only attested in the form *vārayadhvāt*. Here *dhvāt* has the value of a 2nd pl. ending.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *antar evoṣmāṇaṃ vārayadhvāt* 'you (pl.) must cover the heat within' (*Maitr. S.* 3.4.13; also *Ait. Br.* 2.6.14). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *vārayadhvam*.

The *prakriyā* of *vārayadhvāt* is as follows :

(1)	*vrÑ-*				*Dhp.* 5.8
(2)	*vr*	+ *ṆiC*			P. 3.1.26
(3)	*vr*	+ *i*		+ *lOṬ*	P. 3.3.162
(4)	*vr*	+ *i*		+ *dhvam*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*vr*	+ *i*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *dhvam*	P. 3.1.68
(6)	*vr*	+ *i*	+ *a*	+ *dhve*	P. 3.4.79
(7)	*vr*	+ *i*	+ *a*	+ *dhvam*	P. 3.4.91
(5)	*vār*	+ *i*	+ *a*	+ *dhvam*	P. 7.2.115
(6)	*vār*	+ *e*	+ *a*	+ *dhvam*	P. 7.2.84
(7)	*vār*	+ *ay*	+ *a*	+ *dhvam*	P. 6.1.78
(8)	*vār*	+ *ay*	+ *a*	+ *dhvāt*	P. 7.1.42
	vārayadhvāt.				

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.43 YAJADHVAINAM ITI CA 'also (in the Vedic language) the expression *yajadhvainam* "you (pl.) must sacrifice to him" (is found)'

1. This is a *nipātana* rule noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. *Chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Nipātana* rules have no regular *uddeśyavidheyabhāva*, but are to be contextually explained. See *AP* IX, P. 6.4.28, under 2 and 3. Thus tradition assumes that in the expression mentioned *lopa* has been applied to the final consonant of the finite verb ending *dhvam* mentioned in P. 7.1.42. See further under 3.

Usually, *iti* is used in grammar to indicate reference to a meaning. But sometimes it is also used to refer to a wordform. See *AP* VI, P. 2.2.28, under 7.

The function of *ca* is to show connection with the previous rule in so far it deals with the ending *dhvam*.

3. The *KV* explains that deletion takes place of the *m* of *yajadhvam* followed by *enam* by way of *nipātana* 'mention as a ready-made form,' and that *y* comes in place of *v*. Apparently, the *KV* reads the *nipātana* form mentioned in the rule as *yajadhyainam*. Both the Benares and the Hyderabad editions of the *KV* read *yajadhvainam*, and the Hyderabad edition makes no mention of a variant reading. The *Nyāsa* has no comment on the rule, but the *Padamañjarī* notices the incongruity. It explains that the *bahvṛcāḥ*, the RgVedins, teach *v* only, and not *y*, and says that the form showing deletion of *m* only can be considered to be a *nipātana*. According to *SK*, no. 3565, on P. 7.1.43, which presumably follows the *Padamañjarī*, the statement made by the *KV* is wrong. *Yajadhyai* is an attested Vedic infinitive, see Whitney, § 976, where the form is mentioned.

4. The example quoted by the *KV* is *yajadhvainam priyamedhāḥ* 'you (pl.), to whom the intellect is dear, must sacrifice to him' (ṚgV. 8.2.37). Reference is to Indra. The corresponding Sanskrit form is *yajadhvam enam*.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.44 TASYA TĀT '(in the Vedic language) *tāt* comes in place of *ta* (after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*) *tasya*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Tasya* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. It discontinues *dhvamaḥ* form P. 7.1.42. *Ta* is the 2nd pl. *par.* imp. ending. The word *ātmanepadeṣu* from P. 7.1.41 is obviously discontin-

ued. The *vidheya* is *tāt*. It discontinues *dhvāt* from P. 7.1.42. Since *tāt* is *anekāl*, it replaces the whole of *ta* by P. 1.1.55.

The *tāt* of P. 7.1.44 is to be distinguished from the ending *tātAṄ* mentioned in P. 7.1.35. See P. 7.1.35, under 2.

3. The first example quoted by the *KV* is *gātraṃ gātram asyā nūnaṃ kṛṇutāt* 'you (pl.) must certainly cut off limb by limb of that (fem.)' (*Maitr. S.* 4.13.4.25; also *Ait. Br.* 2.6.15.16). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *kṛṇuta*. The second example is *ūvadhyagohaṃ pārthivaṃ khanatāt* 'you (pl.) must dig a hiding place belonging to the earth for the ocean' (?) (*Maitr. S.* 4.13.4.25). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *khanata*. The third example is *asmā rakṣaḥ saṃsṛjatāt* 'you (pl.) must present a demon with a stone' (?) (*Maitr. S.* 4.13.4.25). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *saṃsṛjata*. The fourth example is *sūryaṃ caksur gamayatāt* 'you (pl.) must direct your eye to the sun' (?) (*Maitr. S.* 4.13.4. 24). The Sanskrit form is *gamayata*.

The *prakriyā* of *kṛṇutāt* is as follows :

(1) *kṛvI-*	*Dhp.* 1.629
(2) *kṛ + nUM + v*	P. 7.1.58
kṛnv	
(3) *kṛnv + lOṬ*	P. 3.3.162
(4) *kṛnv + ta*	P. 3.4.101
(5) *kṛnv + u + ta*	P. 3.1.80 (a)
(6) *kṛna + u + ta*	P. 3.1.80 (b)
(7) *kṛn° + u + ta*	P. 6. 4.48
(8) *kṛn + u + tāt*	P. 7.1.44
(9) *kṛṇ + u + tāt*	*Vt.* I on P. 8.4.1
kṛṇutāt.	

4. We note that *u* is an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix. *Ta* is *apit*, and therefore *Ṅit*. Consequently, *guṇa* of *u* is prohibited by P. 1.1.5. In stage (8) *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel by P. 7.3.86 is not applied. The traditional explanation, stated by the *KV* on P. 3.1.80, is that the zero (*lopa*) substitute (of *a* in stage 7) is *sthānivat*. As a result, the vowel *ṛ* of *kṛn°* is not in penultimate position. That is the reason why P. 7.3.86 cannot be applied.

To explain more fully, according to tradition *sthānivadbhāva* has two functions, a positive one, which allows operations, and a negative one, which disallows them. They are known as *bhāvātideśa* 'transference (of features of the *sthānin* to the

substitute) in order to allow an operation to take place' and *abhāvātideśa* 'transference (of features, etc.) in order not to allow, etc.' respectively. See *STHĀNI*, Pt. I, Note (136). At the stage *kṛna + u + ta guṇa* by P. 7.3.86 cannot be applied to the *iK*-vowel *ṛ* because it does not occur in prefinal position of the verbal base. But after the deletion of *a* by P. 6.4.48 the *ṛ* does occur in that position. So P. 7.3.86 would become applicable. This is not desired. It is prevented by the negative function of *sthānivadbhāva*. Here *sthānivat* is interpreted by Patañjali as *yathā sthānini* 'just as when the *sthānin* is (still) there.' In stage (7) of the derivation shown above *lopa* of *a* is applied. This *lopa* is declared *sthānivat*. Thus we act as if *a* is still there. That suffices to prevent the application of P. 7.3.86.

We have rejected this dual interpretation of *sthānivadbhāva*. See *STHĀNI*, Pt. I, p. 236. *Sthānivadbhāva* has a positive function only. That is to say, it is only meant to feed operations, not to bleed them. Then what about *kṛn + u + ta*? Here *guṇa* of the verbal base vowel is prohibited by P. 1.1.4.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.45 TAPTANAPTANATHANĀŚ CA 'also (in the Vedic language) *taP*, *tanaP*, *tana* and *thana* (come in place of *ta* after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting Vedic peculiarities.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*) *tasya*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Tasya* is continued from P. 7.1.44. It refers to the 2nd pl. *parasmaipada* imperative ending. The *vidheya* is *taptanaptanathanāḥ*. The *KV*, following *Vt.* IV on P. 3.1.83, explains that *anubandha P* serves to indicate *aṅittva* 'not being *Ṅit*.' Reference is to P. 1.2.4. Therefore *guṇavṛddhī* (prohibited for *Ṅit* elements by P. 1.1.5) are allowed.

The function of *ca* is to show connection with the previous rule.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *taP*

śṛṇota grāvāṇaḥ 'you, pressing stones, hear' (*Taitt. Br.* 1.3.13.1). In *śṛṇota guṇa* is applied because *taP* is *Pit*, and, therefore, *aṅit*. The corresponding Sanskrit form is *śṛṇuta*. The example stems from Patañjali on *Vt.* IV on P. 3.1.83 (*Mbh.* II, p. 63, line 14).

sunota 'you (pl) must press' (ṚgV. 7.32.8). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *sunuta*.

(2) For *tanaP*

saṃ varatrā dadhātana 'fasten (2 pl. imp.) the ropes' (ṚgV. 10.101.5). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *dhatta*.

(3) For *tana*

jujuṣṭana 'you, be pleased' (2nd pl. imp.) (ṚgV. 4.36.7). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *juṣata*. In the Vedic form *Ślu* is applied instead of *ŚaP*, by P. 2.4.75. If *Ślu*, then reduplication by P. 6.1.10.

(4) For *thana*

yad iṣṭhana 'that you must desire' (ṚgV. 10.63.6). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *yad icchata*.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.46 IDANTO MASI '(in the Vedic language we find) *masi*, which ends in *iT*, after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*). Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. The rule does not mention a *sthānin* in the form of a *sthāneyogā ṣaṣṭhī*. However, since P. 7.1.46 comes within a context of substitution, it is clear that *masi* is meant to come in place of the 1st pl. *par*. ending *mas*. The *vidheya* is *idantaḥ masi*. It discontinues *taptanap*, etc. from P. 7.1.45. The *Nyāsa* notes that *masi* is an *avibhaktiko nirdeśaḥ* and refers to P. 7.1.39. The *T* in *iT* serves to delimit the vowel quantity by P. 1.1.70.

According to the *KV*, the *i* added to *mas* is an augment. Accordingly, the proper Pāṇinian formulation of the rule should be *masa ik*, like *ktvo yak* in P. 7.1.47. But the difficulty in this formulation is that *iK* might be taken as a *pratyāhāra* 'abbreviative designation,' as pointed out by the *Nyāsa*.

According to Whitney, § 548, the earliest form of the first person pl. ending is *masi*. In the oldest language it is found more frequently than *mas*. In classical Sanskrit *mas* is the exclusive ending. To the *KV*, however, *mas* is the regular verb ending (see P. 7.1.39, under 3) and *masi* is regarded as its substitute. Referring to *PN*, *pbh*. 11, the *KV* says that by *mas masi* is included. That is to say, whatever applies in connection with *mas* applies also in connection with *masi*.

3. In *mas* (P. 3.4.78), like in the case of *Jas* (P. 4.1.2), the final *s* could be considered *it* by P. 1.3.3, and be deleted by P. 1.3.9. This is not desired. To prevent this, Pāṇini has specifically phrased the prohibition for *s* in final position of a *vibhakti* 'case ending or finite verb ending' by P. 1.3.4.

To prevent deletion of the final consonant of a suffix, a vowel may be added to the suffix. An example is the *taddhita* suffix mentioned as *gmini* in P. 5.2.124. Here, since *n* does not occur in final position of the suffix due to the addition of *i*, it is not deleted by P. 1.3.9.

If it is accepted - as Sanskrit grammatical tradition does - that *masi* is to be analysed as *mas* + the augment *i*, it is in line with *jasi* in P. 7.1.50. Both suffixes are mentioned as ending in short *i*. However, in view of P. 1.3.4, in both cases the *i* is redundantly added. We may, therefore, take it that the two rules concerned, which are Vedic rules, belong to a grammatical tradition which disregards P. 1.3.4, and have been inserted in the A. from an unknown source.

4. The first example quoted by the *KV* are *punas tvoddīpayāmasi* 'again we kindle you' (*Śaunaka Ath.V*. 12.2.5). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *uddīpayāmaḥ*. The second example is *śalabhaṃ bhañjayāmasi* 'we cause to shatter the locust' (?) (*Paippalāda S*. 5.20.4). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *bhañjayāmaḥ*. The third example is *tvayi rātriṃ vasāmasi* 'we stay the night at your place' (*Śaunaka Ath. V*. 19.47.9). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *vasāmaḥ*.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.47 KTVO YAK '(in the Vedic language) *yaK* (is added) to *Ktvā* (after a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*) *ktvaḥ*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma* from P. 6.4.1. *Ktvaḥ* is a non-

technical gen. in the sense of a part-whole relation. This sense is indicated by the *anubandha* K in *yaK*. The same form, but with the value of a technical genitive, is used in P. 7.1.37. The *vidheya* is *yaK*. It discontinues *idanto masi* from P. 7.1.46. *YaK* is an augment which is added at the end of a suffix by P. 1.1.46. Whitney, § 993 b, notes that in the Veda three absolutive formations are used, namely, ending in *tvā*, *tvāya* and *tvī*. Of these the *tvī* formation is the commonest. Compare P. 7.1.49.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *dattvāya savitā dhiyaḥ* 'the sun after having granted intellect' (?), source unknown. Wrongly identified by the Hyderabad *KV* edition. The corresponding Sanskrit form is *dattvā*.

4. The *KV* raises the question why the present rule has not been stated immediately after P. 7.1.38. The answer is that in the latter rule the word *samāse* is continued. In the present rule this is not desired.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.48 IṢṬVĪNAM ITI CA 'also (in the Vedic language) the expression *iṣṭvīnam* "after having sacrificed" (is found)'

1. This is a *nipātanasūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity. Compare P. 7.1.43 where the word *iti* is also used to refer to a wordform.

2. *Chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. Since P. 7.1.48 is a *nipātana* rule, there is no regular *uddeśyavidheyabhāva*. See P. 7.1.43, under 2.

According to Whitney, § 993 c., the absolutive formation in *tvīnam*, although known to grammarians as Vedic usage, is nowhere found to occur. The *KV* explains *iṣṭvīnam* as *yaj* + *Ktvā*, where *īnam* has replaced *Ktvā*. Thus, here also the Vedic formation is regarded as a substitute of the regular Sanskrit formation. Compare P. 7.1.39, under 3.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *iṣṭvīnaṃ devān* 'after having sacrificed to the gods.' The source is indicated by the *KV* Hyderabad ed. as *Āśvalāyana Śrauta Pr.* 204. The corresponding Sanskrit form is *iṣṭvā*.

The *prakriyā* of *iṣṭvīnam* is as follows :

(1)	*yajA-*	*Dhp.* 1.1051
(2)	*yaj* + *Ktvā*	P. 3.4.21

(3)	*iaj*	+ *tvā*	P. 6.1.15
(4)	*ij*	+ *tvā*	P. 6.1.108
(5)	*ij*	+ *tvīnam*	P. 7.1.48
(6)	*iṣ*	+ *tvīnam*	P. 8.2.36
(7)	*iṣ*	+ *ṭvīnam*	P. 8.4.41
	iṣṭvīnam.		

Because *Ktvā* is *Kit*, *saṃprasāraṇa* is applied by P. 6.1.15.

4. According to the *KV*, the form *pītvīnam* 'after having drunk' is also desired. It can be justified by assuming that the purpose of *ca* in the present rule is to allow additional forms which have not been stated. The *ā* of *pā-* is replaced by *ī* by P. 6.4.66.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.49 SNĀTVYĀDAYAŚ CA 'also (in the Vedic language the forms) beginning with *snātvī* "after having taken bath" (are found)'

1. This is a *nipātanasūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. *Chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. Since P. 7.1.49 is a *nipātana* rule, there is no regular *uddeśyavidheyabhāva*. See P. 7.1.43, under 2. *Snātvī-ādi* is a *gaṇa* for which two items have been quoted only, *snātvī* and *pītvī* 'after having drunk.' The *KV* notes that the word *ādi* here conveys the sense of *prakāra* 'type, kind.' Therefore the *snātvyādi-gaṇa* is an *ākṛtigaṇa* 'sample list.'

The function of *ca* is to show connection with the previous rule.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *snātvi malād iva* 'after having taken a bath from dirt, as it were' (*Maitr. S.* 3.11.10) and *pītvī somasya vavṛdhe* 'after having drunk *soma* he (Indra) became strong' (ṚgV. 3.40.7). The corresponding Sanskrit forms are *snātva* and *pītvā*. The *ā* of *pā-* is replaced by *ī* by P. 6.4.66.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.50 ĀJJASER ASUK '*asUK* (is added) to *Jas* (after a nominal *aṅga*) ending in *a*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*chandasi aṅgāt*) *āt jaseḥ*. Here *chandasi* is continued from P. 7.1.38. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Āt* is interpreted to mean *avarṇa-antāt* by P. 7.1.72. By P. 1.1.69 *a* stands for its *savarṇa* varieties also. *Āt jaseḥ* discontinues *ktvaḥ* from P. 7.1.47. *AsUK* is an augment which is to be added to a given element as its final part, by P. 1.1.40. It discontinues *yaK* from P. 7.1.47. *Jas* is the pl. nom. case ending introduced by P. 4.1.2. For the *i* of *Jasi* see P. 7.1.46, under 3. *Jaseḥ* is a non-technical genitive in the sense of a part-whole relation.

According to the phrasing of the present rule, *as* is the augment of *Jas*, so that the derivational order of elements will be *aṅga* + (*Jas* + *asUK*). As will be clear later on, Patañjali proposes to change that order. See under 4, below.

3. The first example quoted by the *KV* is *brāhmaṇāsaḥ pitaraḥ somyāsaḥ* 'the brahmins, your fathers, worthy of *soma*' (ṚgV. 6.75.10). The corresponding Sanskrit form is *brāhmaṇāḥ somyāḥ*. The second example is *ye pūrvāso ya uparāsaḥ* 'those who were the earlier ones (and) those who were the later ones' (ṚgV. 10.15.2). The *KV* notes that here, since *pūrva* and *upara* (veda) are pronominal adjectives, the substitution of *ŚĪ* for *Jas* is applicable by P. 7.1.17. That would give us *pūrva* / *upara* + *Ī* + *asUK*, and subsequently *pūrve* / *upare* + *as*, by P. 6.1.87. Here the application of P. 6.1.78 results in the forms **pūrvayas* / *uparayas*, which is not desired.

Traditionally, in the case of conflict, the *para* 'later' rule is to be applied. Accordingly, out of P. 7.1.17 and P. 7.1.50, the latter rule prevails. That gives us *pūrva* / *upara* + *Jas* + *as*. But here, after the application of the *para* rule, P. 7.1.17 becomes applicable again. This is called *punaḥprasaṅgavijñāna* 'the understanding that a superseded rule has scope for application again.' Reference is to *PN*, *pbh*. 39. Against this, *PN*, *pbh*. 40 tells us that once a *para* rule has superseded an earlier rule, the earlier rule (in our case, P. 7.1.17) has been superseded once for all. By this *pbh*. we derive the forms *pūrvāsas* / *uparāsas* (*pūrva* / *upara* + *Jas* + *as*), as desired, by applying P. 6.1.101. Here the *KV* follows Patañjali's *siddhānta*. See below, under 4.

4. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Patañjali notes that in the derivation of *pūrvāsas* and *uparāsas* P. 7.1.17 (*Śībhāva*) is applicable. He first tries to remove the difficulty by assuming that *asUK* is the final element of the preceding unit, namely, *pūrva* / *upara*. Thereby the derivational order of elements (see under 2., above) is changed into (*aṅga* + *asUK*) + *Jas*. As explained by the *Padamañjarī* on the present rule, this change amounts to rephrasing P. 7.1.50 as *asya jaser asuk* '*asUK* is added to *jasi* belonging to an *aṅga* ending in *a*' (*asya* = *avarṇa*-

antasya). Thus [*pūrva* + *asUK*] becomes the *aṅga* with regard to *Jas*. Consequently, since now the preceding *aṅga* ends in *s*, P 7.1.17 cannot become applicable.

But if *asUK* is assumed to be the final element of the preceding *aṅga*, then how to justify forms like *brāhmaṇāsaḥ* and *somyāsaḥ* in the first example? In the stage [*brāhmaṇa* + *asUK*] + *Jas* P. 6.1.97 (*pararūpa-ekādeśa*) becomes applicable to [*brāhmaṇa* + *asUK*]. The resulting form is *brāhmaṇas*. Then, after the addition of *Jas* the final form would be **brāhmaṇasas*, which is not desired. To remove this difficulty Patañjali presents the following argument. If Pāṇini had meant us to apply P. 6.1.97, he might as well have stated *sUK*, instead of *asUK* The result would be the same. Since Pāṇini did not do so, and, since the *a* of *asUK* is, in fact, needed for the application of P. 6.1.101 to give us the desired forms *brāhmaṇāsaḥ* and *somyāsaḥ*, we infer from the statement of *asUK* that Pāṇini meant us to apply the *savarṇadīrgha*-rule, and to block the application of P. 6.1.97.

Patañjali then suggests another rephrasing of the rule. Suppose P. 7.1.50 reads *asUṬ*, instead of *asUK*. In that case, the augment *as*, being *Ṭit* (P. 1.1.46), becomes the initial part of *JasI*. That gives us *pūrva* + [*asUṬ* + *JasI*]. Here we cannot apply P. 7.1.17, because *asUṬ* intervenes between *pūrva* and *JasI*. The example *brāhmaṇāsas* and *somyāsas* are also taken care of. The drawback of this solution is, of course, that we have to rephrase the rule. Therefore Patañjali rejects both solutions offered by saying that the rule must remain as it is.

Then what? Finally, Patañjali has recourse to *punaḥprasaṅgavijñāna* and to the *sakṛdgati-pbh*s. for which see under 3, above.

5. We venture to suggest still another solution. With reference to the Vedic language we have the maxim *dṛṣṭānuvidhiś chandasi* 'see the Vedic form, then apply a rule (for derivation) accordingly.' Compare *Mbh.* I, p. 55, line 3. Since in *pūrvāsas* / *uparāsaḥ* a substitution of *ŚI* is not seen, P. 7.1.17 is not applied, and the question of conflict does not arise at all.

7.1.51 AŚVA-KṢĪRA-VṚṢA-LAVAṆĀNĀM ĀTMAPRĪTAU KYACI '(*asUK* is added to the nominal *aṅgas* ending in *a*) *aśva* 'stallion,' *kṣīra* 'milk,' *vṛṣa* 'bull' or *lavaṇa* 'salt,' if *KyaC* follows immediately, when one's own pleasure is conveyed'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing particular denominative formations in which the augment *asUK* is used.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*avarṇa-antānām aṅgānām*) *aśva-kṣīra-vṛṣa-lavaṇānām ātmaprītau kyaci*. Here *avarṇa-antānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.50 (*āt*). *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ātmaprītau* is a locative meaning-condition specifying the meaning of the form derived as a whole. Thus *ātmaprītau* becomes an output meaning. Compare *AP* IX, P. 6.4.80, under 2. *Kyaci* is a technical locative by P. 1.1.66. *KyaC* is the suffix introduced by P. 3.1.8 to form denominatives. It is added to a nominal *aṅga* representing the object of an action desired by the agent for his own satisfaction. The *vidheya* is (*asUK*), continued from P. 7.1.50.

The *KV* notes that the word *chandasi* from P. 7.1.38 is discontinued.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *aśvasyati vaḍavā* 'the mare lusts for the stallion,' *kṣīrasyati māṇavakaḥ* 'the boy craves milk,' *vṛṣasyati gauḥ* 'the cow lusts for the bull' and *lavaṇasyaty uṣṭraḥ* 'the camel eagerly desires salt.' Compare Whitney, § 1064.

The derivation of *vṛṣasyati* is as follows:

(1)	(*vṛṣa* + *am*) + *KyaC*	P. 3.1.8; 3.1.5 (*dhātu*)
(2)	(*vṛṣa* + °) + *ya*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(*vṛṣa* + *asUK*) + *ya*	P. 7.1.51
(4)	(*vṛṣa* + *as*) + *ya* + *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*vṛṣa* + *as* + *ya* + *ŚaP* + *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(6)	*vṛṣ* *as* + *ya* + *ti*	P. 6.1.97 (twice)
	vṛṣasyati.	

4. To point out the significance of the word *ātmaprītau* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *aśvīyati* 'he treats like a horse,' *kṣīrīyati* 'he treats like milk,' *vṛṣīyati* 'he treats like a bull' and *lavaṇīyati* 'he treats like salt.' The *Nyāsa* explains that here *KyaC* is used in the sense of *ācāra* 'behaviour,' when a comparison is made, by P. 3.1.10, and that the *ī*-substitute is by P. 7.4.33.

5. The *KV* then quotes two *Vts* and two *Vt.*-like statements, all of them taken from The latter two are taken from Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the present rule. See under 6, below.

6. We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that in the case of *aśva* and *vṛṣa KyaC* is added to express desire for union.

Vt. II says that in the case of *kṣīra* and *lavana KyaC* is added to express *lālasā* 'eager desire.' The *KV* explains *lālasā* as *tṛṣṇātireka* 'an excessive thirst for.' Elsewhere when simply one's own pleasure is to be conveyed P. 7.1.51 is not applied.

The first *Vt.*-like statement mentions the opinion of another grammarian, namely, that *KyaC* may be added to any *prātipadika* to express *lālasā* 'eager desire.' The second also mentions the opinion of another grammarian, namely, that a rule has to be stated regarding the augment *sUK*. The examples are *dadhiṣyati* 'he eagerly desires *dadhi*' and *madhuṣyati* 'he eagerly desires honey.'

7.1.52 ĀMI SARVANĀMNAḤ SUṬ 'if *ām* follows immediately after (an *aṅga* called) *sarvanāman* (ending in *a*), *sUṬ* (is added to *ām*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *sUṬ* for *ām* when added to a pronominal stem ending in *a*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*āt aṅgāt*) *sarvanāmnaḥ āmi*. Here *āt*, that is, *avarṇa-antāt*, is continued from P. 7.1.50, As stated before (P. 7.1.50, under 2) *a* includes its *savarṇa* variety *ā* also. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmnaḥ* is a technical abl.by P. 1.1.67. *Sarvanāman* is the designation introduced by P. 1.1.27 for *sarva*, etc. *Sarvanāmnaḥ* discontinues *aśva...lavaṇānām* from P. 7.1.51. *Āmi* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. It discontinues *KyacI* from P. 7.1.51. *Ām* is the pl. gen. case ending introduced by P. 4.1.2. The *vidheya* is *sUṬ*. This is an augment to be added as the initial phoneme to a given element by P. 1.1.46. It discontinues *asUK* from P. 7.1.50.

The *Nyāsa* notes that the present rule is an exception to P. 7.1.54, which prescribes the augment *nUṬ* for *ām*.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *sarveṣām* 'of all,' *viśveṣām* 'of all,' *yeṣām* 'of those who / which (masc. / ntr.),' *teṣām* 'of those (masc. / ntr.),' *sarvāsām* 'of all (fem.),' *yāsām* 'of those who / which (fem.),' *tāsām* 'of those (fem.). For the *e*-substitution apply P. 7.3.103. The *KV* explains that P. 7.1.52 refers to *sarvanāmans* ending in *a* or *ā* only. The counterexample is *bhavatām* 'of you, sirs.'

4. The *KV* explains that the *ām* mentioned in the present rule is the pl. gen. ending *ām*, not the *ām* mentioned in P. 7.3.116. This rule prescribes *ām* as the substitute for the sg. loc. ending *Ṅi* after fem. stems. Here *ām* takes the augments *āṬ* (P. 7.3.112), *yāṬ* (P. 7.3.113) and *syāṬ* (P. 7.3.114). The argument does not involve

the *sUT* of P. 7.4.52, but the augment *nUṬ* of P. 7.1.54, which is also added to form the pl. gen. of fem. stems. The question is, why is *nUṬ* not applied in the sg. loc. of fem. stems after *Ṅi* has been replaced by *ām*? For example, we apply P. 7.3.116 to derive the stage *nadī* + *ām*. Then, by P. 7.3.112 we will derive the stage *nadī* + *āṬ* + *ām*. But why not first apply *nUṬ* here by P. 7.1.54 (*nadī*) before adding *āṬ*? The point is that, once *nUṬ* has been added to *ām*, we cannot apply *āṬ* any more. The reason is that *nUṬ* intervenes. Thus we have a conflict. As stated by Patañjali (*Mbh*. III, p. 260, line 9), from whom the *KV* borrows the argument, the conflict is solved by invoking the *para*-principle (P. 1.4.2). *ĀṬ* being prescribed by the later rule prevails.

As argued elsewhere (*AP* IV, p. 15-20), the *para*-principle is out. Instead, the *utsarga-apavāda* principle is to be invoked. Since P. 7.3.112-114 are special rules in relation to P. 7.3.116, they prevail over *nUṬ* by P. 7.1.54.

There is also a *taddhita* suffix *ām* prescribed by P. 5.4.11 after the comparative and superlative suffixes *tara* and *tama* and after other stems, and an *ām* prescribed by P. 3.1.35 as a (periphrastic) pf. stem forming suffix. These two are not meant for *sarvanāmans*, or, as Patañjali says (*Mbh*. III, p. 259, lines 3-4), they are excluded because they are provided with an *anubandha*, whereas the *ām* of P. 7.1.52 is not. Compare *PN*, *pbh*. 81.

5. The *KV* notes that *āmi* is mentioned as technical loc. for the sake of the next rule, P. 7.1.53. Because in the present rule *sarvanāmnaḥ* is an abl., we have to assume that here *āmi* represents a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. That is to say, the construction of P. 7.1.52 is assumed to be *āmaḥ sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ* '*sUṬ* is added after *ām* (which comes) after a *sarvanāman*.'

In rules prescribing *Ṭit* augments Pāṇini uses locative forms, like *āmi*, more than genitive forms, like *āmah*. Examples are P. 7.2.70 (*sye*), 71 (*sici*), 72 (*parasmaipadesu*), 74 (*sani*), 76 (*sārvadhātuke*), 78 (*dhve*), and P. 8.3.29 (*si*). In these cases we cannot argue that the loc. case ending is used for the sake of the next rule. It has been used only in the technical sense of 'if x follows immediately.' That applies to the present rule also.

6. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* common to P. 7.1.52-54. The *bhāṣya* starts with the observation that there are many *āms* in grammar. Three different *āms* are enumerated, namely, the ones prescribed by P. 3.1.35, P. 5.4.11, and P. 7.3.116. Patañjali goes to great lengths to explain why these *āms* are not included under the *ām* mentioned in P. 7.1.54. A sample of the discussion

regarding P. 7.3.116 has been stated under 4, above. The discussion in the *Mbh.* is rather technical and does not contribute much to our understanding of Pāṇinian procedure. P. 3.1.35 and P. 5.4.111 deal with derivational morphology, rather than with inflectional morphology. See the Excursus on P. 7.1.13. Since all three *āms* mentioned above are out, that leaves the *ām* prescribed by P. 7.1.52.

7.1.53 TRES TRAYAḤ '*traya* (comes) in place of (the *aṅga) tri* "three," (if *ām* follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *traya* for *tri*, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*āmi aṅgasya*) *treḥ*. Here *āmi* is continued from P. 7.1.52. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. It is used in apposition with *treḥ*. Therefore it shares the value of a technical gen. with *treḥ* by P. 1.1.49. *Treḥ* discontinues *sarvanāmnaḥ* from P. 7.1.52. *Tri* is a numeral stem. The word *āt* from P. 7.1.50 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. There is no point in continuing it. The *vidheya* is *traya*. It discontinues *sUṬ* from P. 7.1.52. Since *traya* is *anekāl*, it replaces the whole of the *sthānin tri* by P. 1.1.55.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *trayāṇām* 'of the three.' Here the augment *nUṬ* is added by P. 7.1.54. Lengthening of the final stem vowel is by P. 7.3.102. *Ṇatva* is by P. 8.4.2.

4. The *KV* notes that the form *trīṇām* is also desired in the Vedic language. Compare Whitney, § 482 e. The example is *tṛīṇām api samudrāṇām* 'of the three oceans' (source unknown).

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.54 HRASVANADYĀPO NUṬ '*nUṬ* (is added to *ām*), if *ām* follows imme-diately after (a nominal *aṅga* ending in) a short vowel, or (a nominal *aṅga* ending in the suffixes called) *nadī*, or (a nominal *aṅga* ending in) *āP*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUṬ* for *ām* in the cases stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*āmi aṅgāt*) *hrasvanadyāpaḥ*. Here *āmi* is continued from P. 7.1.52 *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Hrasva* is interpreted to mean *hrasvānta* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Nadī* is the name given to

the suffixes *ī* and *ū* forming a fem. nominal stem by P. 1.4.3. *ĀP* is the short form for the three fem. suffixes *ṬāP*, *ḌāP* and *CāP* introduced by P. 4.1.5, 13 and 74. The *vidheya* is *nUṬ*. According to P. 1.1.46, *nUṬ* is added as the initial phoneme to a given element, in our case, the gen. case ending *ām*. *SUṬ* from P. 7.1.53 has already been discontinued by *traya* in P. 7.1.53.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are the following :

(1) For *hrasvānta* stems

vṛkṣāṇām 'of the trees,' *plakṣāṇam* 'of the *plakṣa* trees,' *agnīnām* 'of the fires,' *vāyūnām* 'of the winds,' *kartṝṇām* 'of the agents'

(2) For *nadī* words

kumārīṇām 'of the young girls,' *kiśorīṇām* 'of the female colts,' *gaurīṇām* 'of the Gaurīs,' *śārṅgaravīṇām* 'of the Śārṅgaravīs,' *lakṣmīṇām* 'of the Lakṣmīs', *brahmabandhūnām* 'of the brahmin women who neglect their duties' and *vīrabandhūnām* 'of courageous female relatives.' *Kumārī*, *gaurī*, *śārṅgaravī* and *brahmabandhū* have been mentioned as examples of *nadī* words by the *KV* on P. 1.4.3. See *AP* IV, p. 43.

(3) For words ending in *āP*

mālānām 'of the garlands,' *bahurājānām* 'of ones (fem.) having many kings,' *kārīṣagandhyānām* 'of the female descendants of Karīṣagandhi.' In the latter two cps the stem ends in *ḌāP* by P. 4.1.13. Accordingly, the *ṭi*-portion of the cp. is deleted by P. 6.4.143.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.55 ṢAṬCATURBHYAŚ CA 'also (*nUṬ* is added to *ām*) after (the *aṅgas* technically named) *ṣaṣ* and (after the *aṅga*) *catur* 'four,' (if *ām* follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUṬ* for *ām* after specified numeral stems.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*āmi aṅgebhyaḥ*) *ṣaṭcaturbhyaḥ*. Here *āmi* is continued from P. 7.1.52. *Aṅgebhyaḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Ṣaṭcaturbhyaḥ* is a technical ablative by P. 1.1.67. *Ṣaṣ* is the technical name given

to the numerals ending in *ṣ* like *ṣaṣ*, and ending in *n*, like *pañcan*, by P. 1.1.24. Compare Whitney, § 484. The *vidheya* is (*nuṭ*), continued from P. 7.1.54.

Ca functions as a boundary marker. See *FANU*, p. 36, 232.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *ṣaṇṇām* 'of the six,' *pañcānām* 'of the five,' *saptānām* 'of the seven,' (lengthening of the final stem vowel by P. 6.4.7, and deletion of final *n* by P. 8.2.7), *navānām* 'of the nine,' *daśānām* 'of the ten' and *caturṇām* 'of the four (masc. / ntr).' The *Nyāsa* explains that in order to derive the form *ṣaṇṇām* we have to apply P. 8.2.38, P. 8.4.41-42 and P. 8.4.45, in that order. Thus we first replace the *t* of *ṣaṭ* by *ḍ*, then the *n* of *nUṬ* by retroflex *ṇ*, and finally the *ḍ* of *ṣaḍ* by *n*.

4. The *KV* notes that the designation *ṣaṣ* has not been prescribed for a numeral ending in *r*, so the the *luk*-deletion by P. 7.1.22 for the pl. nom. and acc. endings does not apply to *catur*.

The *KV* also notes that P. 7.1.55 applies to cps formed with the *ṣaṣ*-numerals and *catur*, if the numeral is the main member of the cp. as far as meaning is concerned. The examples are *paramaṣaṇṇām* 'of the highest six,' *paramapañcānām* 'of the highest five,' *paramasaptānām* 'of the highest seven' and *paramacaturṇām* 'of the highest four.' But when the numeral is the subordinate cp. member, P. 7.1.55 does not apply. That is to say, here *nUṬ* is not added. The examples are the *bv.* cps *priyaṣaṣām* 'of ones to whom six are dear,' *priyapañcānām* 'of ones to whom five are dear' and *priyacaturām* 'of ones to whom four are dear.'

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.56 ŚRĪGRĀMAṆYOŚ CHANDASI 'in the Vedic language (*nUṬ* is added to *ām*) after (the *aṅgas*) *śrī* "wealth" and *grāmaṇī* "village headman"'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity regarding *nUṬ*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*āmi*) *chandasi śrīgrāmaṇyoḥ* (*aṅgayoḥ*). Here *āmi* is continued from P. 7.1.52. *Aṅgayoḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. It is translated as a technical abl. For the use of the dual ending *-os* as an ablative ending see *AP* III, p. 11, 134. For *chandas* see *ATA*, n. 131. The *vidheya* is (*nuṭ*), continued from P. 7.1.54. For the character of Vedic rules see *AP* IX, P. 6.4.58, under 1. We may add that rules phrased for the *bhāṣā* hold for *chandas* also unless

specifically *bhāṣāyām* is stated. But there are Vedic peculiarities which require separate rules. See *PASPA*, Note (4).

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *śrīṇām udāro dharuṇo rayīṇām* '(Agni) liberal with distinctions, supporter of wealth' (ṚgV. 10.45.5) and *api tatra sūtagrāmaṇīnām* '(are) there...of charioteers and village headmen?' (?) (*Kāth. S.* 28.3).

4. The *KV* notes that the designation *nadī* (by P. 1.4.3) is optionally (*vā*) applied to the word *śrī* by P. 1.4.5. Therefore, in the *bhāṣā* we have the choice between *śriyām* and *śrīṇām*. See *AP* IV, p. 48. The opinion of the *KV* is based on the traditional misinterpretation of option words in the *A*. In P. 1.4.5 *na* is continued from P. 1.4.4. *Na* together with *vā* means 'preferably not.' Compare Kiparsky 1979, p. 47-48. That is to say, the designation *nadī* is preferably not applied to *śrī*. In other words, *śriyām* is the preferred form. The present rule, P. 7.1.56, justifies the application of *nUṬ* for the pl. genitive of *śrī* in the Vedic language. Or, in other words, in the Vedic language the designation *nadī* is invariably applied to *strī*. Thus here the augment *nUṬ* is invariably added to *ām*.

5. As regards *grāmaṇī*, the form under discussion is the pl. gen. cp. *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*, a Vedic form. The present rule, P. 7.1.56, justifies the application of *nUṬ* here. The question raised by Patañjali in his *bhāṣya* on the present rule is whether we can justify this form by P. 7.1.54. Derivation is brought in. As explained by the *KV*, that makes a difference. We can derive the cp. as a plural form in the non-technical sense of *sūtāś ca grāmaṇyaś ca* 'charioteers and village headmen,' an *itaretarayogadvandva* cp. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, we can even derive it as a *kdh.* cp. in the sense of *sūtāś ca te grāmaṇyaś ca* 'charioteers and at the same time village headmen.' In both cases the cp.-stem is *sūtagrāmāṇī*, which ends in long *ī*. It follows that P. 7.1.54, which requires a short final vowel, cannot become applicable. To justify the pl. genitive *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*, P. 7.1.56 is required.

But suppose we derive the pl. form *sūtagrāmaṇyaḥ* as based on *ekaśeṣa* (P. 1.2.64) of a neuter *samāhāradvandva* cp. Such a cp. is formed by P. 2.4.17 as a sg. neuter form in which shortening of the final vowel is applied by P. 1.2.47. The resulting cp. stem will be *sūtagrāmaṇi* 'the group of charioteers and village headmen.' But since a *samāhāradvandva* cp. is available in the sg. only, the problem is, how to account for a plural form as clearly presupposed by *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*. That is why *ekaśeṣa* is invoked. The non-technical derivation then will be *sūtagrāmaṇi ca sūtagrāmaṇi ca sūtagrāmaṇi*. Since in this case the cp. stem ends in a short vowel, P. 7.1.54 can take of the form concerned, and the present rule is not needed to justify the form *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*.

6. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali argues that we can do without the rule. Then how to justify the *nUṬ*-forms in the two examples quoted? As regards the form *śrīṇām* in the first example, Patañjali's idea is to regard the word *vā* in P. 1.4.5 as indicative of a *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* 'limited option.' Thus in the Vedic language *nUṬ* will be added to *śrī*, when it is considered to come under *nadī*, in other cases not.

As regards *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*, Patañjali's difficulty is how to account for a cp. stem ending in short *i*, and for a plural form as attested by the genitive *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*. For the argument see under 5, above.

Patañjali's conclusion is that we can manage by P. 7.1.54, and that P. 7.1.56 is not required, neither for *śrī*, nor for *grāmaṇī*. Here the *KV* differs.The rule is required for *śrī*, to have *śrīṇām* as an obligatory form in the Vedic language, but not for justifying the pl. gen. *sūtagrāmaṇīnām*.

To our opinion, P. 7.1.56 is required to justify both the pl. genitive *Nuṭ*-forms *śrīṇām* and *sūtagrāmaṇīnām* in the Vedic language.

7.1.57 GOḤ PĀDĀNTE '(in the Vedic language *nUṬ* is added to *ām*) after (the *aṅga*) *go* "cow; bull" occurring at the end of a *pāda* (if *ām* follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a Vedic peculiarity regarding *go*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*āmi aṅgāt*) *goḥ pādānte*. Here *āmi* is continued from P. 7.1.52. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. A *pāda* is a quarter verse. The *vidheya* is (*Nuṭ*), continued from P. 7.1.54.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *vidmā hi tvā gopatiṃ śūra gonām* 'for we know you (Indra) as the lord of cattle, o brave one' (ṚgV. 10.47.2).

4. To point out the significance of the word *pādānta*, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *gavāṃ gotram udasṛjo yad aṅgiraḥ* 'when you, Angiras, let loose the herd of cows' (ṚgV. 2.23.18). Reference is to Bṛhaspati. By the maxim *sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante* 'in the Vedic language all rules are optional' (*PN*, *pbh.* 35) *nUṬ* is sometimes not found even at the end of a *pāda*. The example is *hantāraṃ śatrūṇāṃ kṛdhi virājaṃ gopatiṃ gavām* 'make (me) a killer of enemies, a ruler, a lord of cattle' (ṚgV. 10.166.1).

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.58 IDITO NUṂ DHĀTOḤ '*nUM* (becomes part) of a verbal base having short *i* as an *it*-letter'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* in connection with a verbal base marked with *I*. It opens a section of rules dealing with *nUM* up to P. 7.1.83 inclusive.

2. The *uddeśya* is *iditaḥ dhātoḥ*. We note that the *KV* does not continue *aṅgasya* from P. 6.4.1 The reason will be clear from the discussion of the rule. *Dhātoh* is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. The term *dhātu* has been defined by enumeration by P. 1.3.1. *Iditaḥ* is a *bv.* cp. in which *T* is added (after the first *i*) to delimit the vowel quantity to short *i* only, by P. 1.1.70. The purpose of adding short *I* as an *anubandha* to a verbal base is stated by the present rule.The word *chandasi* from P, 7.1.57 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. It makes no sense to continue it in the present rule. The *vidheya* is *nUM*. Since *nUM* is *Mit*, it is inserted after the last vowel of the element concerned, in our case, a verbal base, by P. 1.1.47. *NUM* discontinues *nUṬ* from P. 7.1.54.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are the following :

(1) For the verbal base *kuḍI* (*Dhp.* 1.289)

kuṇḍitā 'one who burns,' *kuṇḍitum* 'in order to burn,' *kuṇḍitavyam* 'that which has to be burnt' and *kuṇḍā* 'the burning'

(2) For the verbal base *huḍI* (*Dhp.* 1. 288)

huṇḍitā 'one who collects together,' *huṇḍitum* 'in order to collect together,' *huṇḍitavyam* 'that which has to be collected together,' and *huṇḍā* 'collection'

For the forms *kuṇḍitā* and *huṇḍitā* the *Nyāsa* refers to P. 7.1.94. This rule prescribes the substitution of *anAṄ* for short *ṛ* in final position of a nominal *aṅga*, when the sg. nom. ending *sU* follows immediately. Thus, from *kuṇḍitṛ* + *sU* we derive *kuṇḍitanAṄ* + *s*. Thereafter P. 6.1.68, P. 6.4.8 and P. 8.2.7 are successively applied for the deletion of the case ending *sU*, for lengthening of the *a* in prefinal position of the *aṅga* and for the deletion of the *n* in final position of a *prātipadika*.

For *kuṇḍā* and *huṇḍā* see under 5, below.

4. To point out the significance of the word *iditaḥ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *pacati* 'he cooks' and *paṭhati* 'he recites.' The verbal bases concerned (*pacA*, *Dhp*. 1. 187, and *paṭhA*, *Dhp*. 1.353) are not mentioned as having short *i* as an *it*-letter. But in Westergaard's edition of the *Dhp*., under 1.187, *pac-* is quoted as *pacI-* (*pacA-*).

5. The *KV*, referring to *Vt*. I on the rule, says that this augment *nUM* is inserted already in the *upadeśa* stage of the verbal base, that is, before grammatical operations are applied. Thus, for purposes of derivation the verbal base must be considered to contain *nUM*, even if the mention of the verbal base in the *Dhp*. is without *nUM*. The examples are *kuṇḍā* and *huṇḍā* borrowed from Patañjali. The verbal bases concerned are stated as *kuḍI-* and *huḍI*, without *nUM*. But for the application of P. 3.3.103, which requires a *guru* verbal base vowel, we have to assume that they are to be read as *kuṇḍ-* and *huṇḍ-*, because otherwise this rule could not be applied. P. 3.3.103 prescribes the *kṛt* suffix *a* after specified verbal bases in order to derive a feminine noun in the sense of *bhāva* 'action noun.'

The same holds for the verbal bases mentioned as *dhivI* and *kṛvI* in the *Dhp*. 1.624 and 1. 629. For derivational purposes these two verbal bases are to be read as *dhinv-* and *kṛnv-*,as, in fact, P. 3.1.80 does.

6. Why has the word *dhātoḥ* been mentioned in the rule? For what purpose? Referring to *Vt*. I on the rule, the *KV* says that its purpose is to ensure that the augment *nUM* is inserted at the time when the verbal base concerned is introduced in Pāṇini's *upadeśa*. Reference is to the *Dhātupāṭha*. Thus, as soon as the verbal base makes its appearance, *nUM* is inserted. Only then the *prakriyā* can start and grammatical operations can be applied.

Can't we assign another purpose to the mention of *dhātoḥ*? Suppose, it had been mentioned to prevent the insertion of *nUM* as a result of the fact that *tāsI* and *sIC* have been provided with a short *I*, and are, consequently, considered to be *idit*? *Tāsi* is the marker of the periphrastic future, *lUṬ*, by P. 3.1.33, and *sIC* is the marker of the aorist, *lUN*, by P. 3.1.44. Both suffixes contain short *I*. The point made by the *KV* in the following discussion is that here the *I* does not lead to an *iditkārya* 'a grammatical operation based on short *I* as an *it*-letter.' According to the *KV*, the *I* here is a non-nasal sound (reference is to P. 1.3.2) added for the sake of easy pronunciation only.

The discussion centres around three examples which present difficulties for the assumption that *tāsI* and *sIC* are *anidit* 'not provided with short *I* as an *it*-letter.'

The first example is *amaṃsta* 'he thought.' This is the 3rd sg. *s*-aor. *ātm.* of *man-*. The *prakriyā* is as follows:

(1)		*manA-*					*Dhp.* 4.67
(2)		*man*			+	*lUN*	P. 3.2.110
(3)	*a* +	*man*			+	*lUN*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* +	*man*			+	*ta*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*a* +	*man*	+	*ClI*	+	*ta*	P. 3.1.43
(6)	*a* +	*man*	+	*sIC*	+	*ta*	P. 3.1.44
(7)	*a* +	*maṃ*	+	*s*	+	*ta*	P. 8.3.24
	amaṃsta.						

The difficulty here is, why isn't the *n* of *man* deleted? In stage (6) the *n* occurs in prefinal position of the *aṅga* [*aman* + *s*]. The following suffix *ta* is *Ṅit* by P. 1.2.4. Given the assumption that *sIC* is *anidit*, deletion of *n* is applicable by P. 6.4.24, which is conditioned by *kṅiti*. As stated by the *KV*, deletion of *n* is not applied because of a clue offered by P. 1.2.14. This rule prescribes the *Kittva* of *sIC* when added after *han-* before *ātm.* endings. The idea is that, if P. 6.4.24 were applicable for the deletion of *n*, P. 1.2.14 would be redundant. See further under the following example.

The following example is *āhata* 'he hit.' The *prakriyā*, already stated in *AP* II, p. 24, is repeated here for argument's sake. It goes as follows:

(1)			*hanA-*					*Dhp.* 2.2
(2)	*ā*		+ *han-*					
(3)	*ā*		+ *han*			+	*lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(4)	*ā* +	*aT*	+ *han*			+	*lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(5)	*ā*		+ *han*			+	*lUṄ*	P. 6.1.101
(6)	*ā*		+ *han*			+	*ta*	P. 3.4.78
(7)	*ā*		+ *han*	+	*ClI*	+	*ta*	P. 3.1.44
(8)	*ā*		+ *han*	+	*sIC*	+	*ta*	P.3.1.44; 1.2.14 (*Kittva*)
(9)	*ā*		+ *ha°*	+	*s*	+	*ta*	P. 6.4.37
(10)	*ā*		+ *ha*	+	°	+	*ta*	P. 8.2.27
	āhata.							

Now the argument is that P. 1.2.14 specially prescribes the *Kittva* of *sIC* for the deletion of the *n* of *han-* by P. 6.4.37. But, if *sIC* is *anidit*, as assumed, the *n* could have been deleted by P. 6.2.24. Then why have P. 1.2.14? The very fact that this rule has been prescribed offers us the clue that the *n* of the *aṅga* [*ahan* + s],

like the *n* of [*aman* + s], is not deleted by P. 6.4.24. However, in the case of [*ahan* + s] the deletion of *n* is desired. This deletion is achieved precisely because the *Kittva* prescribed for *sIC* after *han* P. 2.1.14 makes the application of P. 6.4.37 possible.

How about *tasI*? Given the assumption that *tāsI* is *anidit*, the difficulty is, why isn't the *n* in *mantā* 'he will think' deleted? The *prakriyā* is as follows:

(1) *manA-*				*Dhp*.4.67
(2) *man*			+ *lUṬ*	P. 3.3.15
(3) *man*			+ *ta*	P. 3.4.78 (*ātm*. ending)
(4) *man*	+ *tāsI*		+ *ta*	P. 3.1.33 (*tās* is *Ṅit*, P. 1.2.4)
(5) *man*	+ *tās*		+ *Ḍā*	P. 2.4.85
(6) *man*	+ *t*°		+ *ā*	P. 6.4.143
mantā.				

In stage (6) *Ḍā* is *Ṅit*. After the application of P. 6.4.143 the *n* occurs in prefinal position of the *aṅga* [*man* + *t*]. The original form of the *aṅga* is [*man* + *tāsI*] in which *tāsI* is assumed to be *anidit*. Therefore P. 6.4.24 becomes applicable for deleting the *n*. But this rule is not applied, because the deletion of °*ās* by P. 6.4.143 is *asiddhavat* by P. 6.4.22 as far as the application of P. 6.4.24 concerned. Both rules have the same conditioning linguistic element, (*samānāśraya*), namely, *Ḍā*. Since the deletion of °*ās* is *asiddhavat*, there is no *n* in prefinal position. Therefore P. 6.4.24 cannot become applicable. This shows that the *I* of *tāsI* has nothing to do with a deletion of *n*. In fact, it only serves to protect the *s* of *tās* from being deleted by P. 1.3.3. The conclusion of the discussion is that the *I* of *sIC* and *tāsI* is not meant for an *iditkārya* 'grammatical operation due to an element having *I* as an *it*-leter.' The only purpose to be assigned to the mention of *dhātoḥ* in the rule is that *nUM* is to be added already in the *upadeśa*-stage of the *dhātu*.

Here the *Padamañjarī* has an interesting observation. It says that Jayāditya, however, assuming that the *asiddhatva* in the *abhīya*-section is not universally valid (reference is to *Ślokavt*. ii on P. 6.4.121. See *AP* IX, p. 327), held that the mention of *tās* as *tāsI* is meant to prevent the deletion of *n*. To his opinion, the mention of the word *dhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.58 is necessary to prevent the application of P. 7.1.58 in connection with *tāsI*. However, this should not be taken to mean that *upadeśivad-bhāva* is not necessary. This special statement (*Vt*. I on the present rule) is meant to justify the forms *kuṇḍā* and *huṇḍā*. Apparently, if what the *Padamañjaī* says goes back to a reliable source, there was a difference of opinion between Jayāditya and Vāmana on the point concerned.

The discussion on the *anidittva* of *tāsi* and *sIC*, involving three examples finds no mention in the *Vts* or in the *bhāṣya* on P. 7.1.58. We are left wondering about its source.

7. But why is *nUM* not inserted in *bhettā* 'he will break' and *chettā* 'he wil cut up'? Both forms are periphrastic futures formed with *tāsI*. The answer is that the verbal bases concerned have been mentioned as *bhidIR* and *chidIR* respectively in *Dhp.* 7.2 and 3. They are not *idit*, but *irit*. Here *IR* is deleted as a whole by the statement *iritāṃ samudāyasyetsaṃjñā* 'of (verbal bases) having *IR* as *it*-letters the designation *it* applies to the whole (of *IR*).' The statement is a rephrased form of *Vt*. IV on P. 1.3.7. Compare *ira itsaṃjñā vācyā*, mentioned by *SK*, No. 2268, on P. 7.2.4. Since the two verbal bases are not *idit*, P. 7.1.58 cannot become applicable.

However, if *IR* is deleted in two stages, the *R* by P. 1.3.3, and the *I* by P. 1.3.2, the verbal bases become both *Rit* and *Idit*. Accordingly, P. 7.1.58 would become applicable to *bhidIR* and *chidIR*. The result would be the undesired forms **bhenttā* and **chenttā*. To prevent this, the *KV*, continuing the word *anta* from P. 7.1.57, connects it with *idit* in P. 7.1.58. Thereby the latter rule becomes applicable to a verbal base which in the *upadeśa* ends in *iT*. That excludes *bhidIR* and *chiDIR*.

8. We have four *Vts* on the rule In the introductory *bhāṣya* Patañjali raises the question for what purpose the word *dhātoḥ* has been mentioned in the rule. By way of answer he quotes the aor. forms *abhaitsīt* 'he broke' and *acchaitsīt* 'he cut up.'

The *prakriyā* of *abhaitsīt* is as follows:

(1)	*bhidIR-*				*Dhp.* 7.2
(2)	*bhid*			+ *lUṄ*	P. 3.2.110
(3)	*a* + *bhid*			+ *lUṄ*	P. 6.4.71
(4)	*a* + *bhid*			+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(5)	*a* + *bhid*			+ *t°*	P. 3.4.100
(6)	*a* + *bhid*	+ *ClI*		+ *t*	P. 3.4.43
(7)	*a* + *bhid*	+ *sIC*		+ *t*	P. 3.4.44
(8)	*a* + *bhaid*	+ *s*		+ *t*	P. 7.2.3; 1.3.2; 1.3.9
(9)	*a* + *bhaid*	+ *s*	+ *ī*	+ *t*	P. 7.3.96
(10)	*a* + *bhait*	+ *s*	+ *ī*	+ *t*	P. 8.4.55
	abhaitsīt.				

Since one might think that *sIC* is *idit*, one might also think that P. 7.1.58 becomes applicable because of the supposed *anubandha I* of *sIC*. But that is prevented by the word *dhātoḥ* in the rule. *SIC* is not a *dhātu*. Therefore *nUM* is not added.

Vt I says that in the rule prescribing *nUM* the word *upadeśivad* '(treated) like (an element) belonging to the *upadeśa*' should be stated for the sake of the application of a suffix. Patañjali explains that the augment *nUM* should be inserted already in the *upadeśa* stage, that is, before the addition of any suffix. Then, by applying P. 3.3.103 we derive the forms *kuṇḍā* and *huṇḍā*. See under 5, above.

Vt. II says that otherwise, if *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like an element belonging to the *upadeśa*' is not applied, the suffix would be added with regard to a form which does not contain *n*. That would lead to an undesired form, as stated by *Vt.* III.

Vt. III says that, in that case, there would be a chance for applying an undesired suffix. Reference is to the suffix *KtiN* by P. 3.3.94, which would be added to *kuḍ-* and *huḍ-* resulting in the undesired forms **kuṇḍḍi* and **huṇḍḍi*. Here *nUM* is added in the course of the *prakriyā* only, not in the *upadeśa*-stage.

Vt. IV proposes a different purpose for the mention of *dhātu* in the rule. It says that, alternatively, we will apply *nUM* to the *upadeśa* form of the verbal base concerned on the strength of the mention of the word *dhātu* in the rule. That is to say, since otherwise the mention of *dhātu* in P. 7.1.58 would be redundant, we must assume that, as soon as the designation *dhātu* applies (P. 1.3.1), *nUM* is inserted. That is why we can add the suffix *a* which is prescribed by the special rule P. 3.3.103 prevailing over the general suffix *KtiN* by P. 3.3.94.

In his *bhāṣya* Patañjali reminds us that, earlier, in his introductory *bhāṣya*, a different *prayojana* 'purpose' had been assigned to the mention of the word *dhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.58, namely, to prevent the application *nUM* in connection with the aorist marker *sIC*. What do we mean by *prayojana* anyway? It must refer to that grammatical operation which applies necessarily. But no such operation is connected with the *I* of *sIC*. In fact, we might as well read *sAC*, instead of *sIC*. Between the *s* and the *c* some vowel has to be inserted. Pāṇini has selected the *i*, as he did in many other cases. Therefore we cannot say that the *i* is totally without function. But to argue that this *i* is meant for an *iditkārya* is a different, and, as had been shown, un unwarranted matter. There is only one purpose that can be assigned

to the mention of *dhātoḥ*, and that is to make clear that *nUM* is to be added as soon as the designation *dhātu* applies to a given linguistic element.

7.1.59 ŚE MUCĀDINĀM '(*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅgas*) beginning with *muc-* "to release," if *Śa* follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *mucādi* verbal bases on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *śe mucādīnām* (*aṅgānām*). Here *Śe* is a *parasaptamī* referring to the present tense marker *Śa* introduced for *tudādi* verbal bases by P. 3.1.77. It is *Ṅit* by P. 1.2.4. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. Together with *mucādīnām* it is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. Compare *dhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.58. The word *dhātoḥ* from P. 7.1.58 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. *Mucādi* is a sub-*gaṇa* of *tudādayaḥ*, the class VI verbal bases. The sub-*gaṇa* consists of eight verbal bases, listed in the *Dhp.* as 6.136-143. *Śa* is the *vikaraṇa* of the *tudādi* verbal bases, by P. 3.1.77. The word *dhātoḥ* from P. 7.1.58 may be continued. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The *KV* quotes examples for each of the *mucādi* verbal bases, as follows :

(1) *mucḶ-*, *muñcati* 'he releases'

(2) *lupḶ-*, *lumpati* 'he plunders'

(3) *vidḶ-*, *vindati* 'he finds'

The *anubandha Ḷ* has been added to indicate that the aor. marker *ClI* is to be replaced by *aṄ* before *parasmaipada* endings, P. 3.1.55.

(4) *lipI-*, *limpati* 'he smears'

(5) *sicA-*, *siñcati* 'he sprinkles'

(6) *krtI-*, *kṛntati* 'he cuts'

A verbal base marked with long *Ī* does not take *iḍāgama*, by P. 7.2.14.

(7) *khidA-*, *khindati* 'he strikes down'

(8) *piśA-, piṃśati* 'he carves'

4. To point out the significance of the word *śe*, the *KV* quotes the counter-examples *moktā* 'one who releases,' *moktum* 'in order to release' and *moktavyam* 'what has to be released.' The substitution of *k* for *c* is by P.8.2.30.

To point out the significance of the word *mucādīnām*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *tudati* 'he strikes' and *nudati* 'he pushes,' both class VI verbal bases.

5. The *KV* then quotes *Vt.* I on the rule. The *Vt.* mentions the *tṛmpādi-gaṇa*, the *KV* gives the list, i.e. the *tṛmphādi-gaṇa*. Ten verbal bases are enumerated in pairs of two. They are *tṛphA- / tṛmphA-* 'to satisfy,' *dṛphA- / dṛmphA* 'to torture,' *guphA- / gumphA-* 'to string together,' *ubhA- / umbhA-* 'to fill' and *śubhA- / śumbhA-* 'to adorn.' They have been mentioned in the *Dhp.* under 6.24, 28 and 31-33 respectively.

According to the *KV*, for the *tṛmphādi* verbal bases which end in a nasal followed by a consonant, after the nasal has been deleted by P. 6.4.24, the augment *nUM* is prescribed. That *nUM* is not deleted on the strength of its prescription, that is, because otherwise its prescription would be pointless. Thus we have *tṛmphati* 'he satisfies,' *dṛmphati* 'he tortures,' *gumphati* 'he strings together,' *umbhati* 'he fills' and *śumbhati* 'he adorns.' On the other hand, for the other verbal bases which do not end in a nasal + consonant we have *tṛphati, dṛphati, guphato, ubhati* and *śubhati*. Here *nUM* is not added by P. 7.1.59.

6. We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that the *tṛmpādi* verbal bases take *nUM* when *Śa* follows. Reference is to *tṛpA-* and *tṛnph-* mentioned in the *Dhp.* under 6.24 and 25. The examples quoted by Patañjali are *tṛmpati* 'he satisfies' and *tṛmphati* in the same meaning. In the derivation the *m* is deleted by P. 6.4.24. Thereafter *nUM* is installed by the present *Vt.* For the *anusvāra* and *parasavarṇa* P. 8.3.24 and P. 8.4.58 are successively applied.

Patañjali raises the question what is the point in prescribing *nUM* here when these verbal bases have already been mentioned with *n* in prefinal position in the *Dhp.* His answer is that they are not read with *nUM* attached.

Vt. II states the reason for *Vt.* I. It is because the *n* has been deleted. Patañjali explains that deletion has taken place by P. 6.4.24. But what if these *tṛmpādi* bases were read as provided with *IT* in the *Dhp.*, that is, as *tṛpI*, etc.?

Patañjali explains that this is not possible. The reason is that, that once these verbal bases are *idit*, we will justify *tṛmphati* and *dṛmphati* by P. 7.1.58, but we cannot delete *nUM*. Consequently, we cannot justify the forms *tṛpita* 'satisfied' and *dṛpita* 'tortured.' But what if they are included in the *mucādi-gaṇa*? That is o.k.

7.1.60 MASJINAŚOR JHALI '(*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅgas*) *masj-* "to plunge into" and *naś-* "to perish," if (a suffix beginning with) a *jhaL*-sound follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for two verbal bases on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *masjinaśoḥ* (*aṅgayoḥ*) *jhali*. Here *aṅgayoḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. Together with *masjinaśoḥ* it is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. *Masji* is the quotation form by *Vt*. II on P. 3.3.108 of the verbal base mentioned as *ḌUmasjO* in the *Dhp*. 6.122. Here *ḌU* causes the addition of the suffix *Ktri* after the verbal base by P. 3.3.88. The *taddhita* suffix *maP* is invariably added by P. 4.4.20. The *anubandha O* indicates that *n* is to be substituted for *t* in *niṣṭhā* forms, by P. 8.2.45. *Naś-* is mentioned as *ṇaśA* in the *Dhp*. 4.85, as belonging to the *radhādi-gaṇa*, a sub-*gaṇa* of *divādayaḥ*. The retroflex initial *ṇ* is replaced by dental *n* by P. 6.1.65. *Jhali* is a technical locative by P. 1.1.66. The *pratyāhāra jhaL* includes all consonants except nasals. *Jhali* is interpreted to mean *jhalādau* by the *tadādividhi* (*Vt*. XXII on P. 1.1.72). The word *pratyaye* is understood. Compare *AP* IX, P. 6.4.15, under 2. *Jhali* discontinues *Śe* from P. 7.1.59. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are the following :

(A) For *masj-*

maṅktā 'one who plunges into,' *maṅktum* 'in order to plunge into' and *maṅktavyam* 'that which has to be plunged into'

The derivation of *maṅktā*, in essence explained by the *Nyāsa*, is as follows :

(1)	*ḌU masjO*	*Dhp*. 6.122
(2)	*mas-nUM-j + tṛC*	*Vt*. II on P. 1.1.47 P. 3.3.169 (the augment *iṬ* is not added, by P. 7.2.10)
(3)	*masnj + tṛ + sU*	P. 4.1.2

(4)	*masnj*	+ *tanAṄ* + *s*	P. 7.1.94
(5)	*masnj*	+ *tā̃n* + *s*	P. 6.4.8
(6)	*masnj*	+ *tā̃n* + °	P. 6.1.68
(7)	*masnj*	+ *tā̃*°	P. 8.2.7
(8)	*ma°nj*	+ *tā̃*	P. 8.2.29
(9)	*mang*	+ *tā̃*	P. 8.2.30
(10)	*maṃg*	+ *tā̃*	P. 8.3.24
(11)	*maṅg*	+ *tā̃*	P. 8.4.55
(12)	*maṅk*	+ *tā̃*	P. 8.4.58
	maṅktā.		

(B) For *naś*

naṃṣṭā 'one who perishes,' *naṃṣṭum* 'in order to perish' and *naṃṣṭavyam* 'that which has to perish.' In all these forms the augment *iṬ*, which is the preferred option by P. 7.2.45 (*vā*, continued from P. 7.2.44), is not applied.

4. To point out the significance of the word *jhali* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *majjanam* 'plunging into' and *naśanam* 'perishing.' As explained by the *Nyāsa*, these are *LyuṬ* derivations. The derivation of *majjana* is as follows :

(2)	*masj* + *LyuṬ*	P. 3.3.115
(3)	*masj* + *ana*	P. 7.1.1
(4)	*maśj* + *ana*	P. 8.4.40
(5)	*majj* + *ana*	P. 8.4.53
	majjana.	

5. The *KV* then quotes the statement *masjer antyāt pūrvaṃ numam icchanti* '(grammarians) desire that *nUM* comes immediately before the last (sound) of *masji*.' Reference is to *Vt*. II on P. 1.1.47. Since *nUM* is *Mit*, it should come after the last vowel of the linguistic element concerned, but *Vt* II on P. 1.1.47 specifically states that in the case of *masj*- *nUM* is added before the last sound of the verbal base. Tradition applies this *Vt*. in all derivations of *masj*- involving *nUM*. The examples are *magnaḥ* 'one plunged into' (sg. nom. masc.) and *magnavān* 'one who has plunged into' (sg. nom. masc.).

The derivation of *magna* is as follows :

(1) *ḌU masjO* *Dhp*. 6.122

(2)	*masj*	+	*Kta*	P. 3.4.70
(3)	*mas-nUM-j*	+	*ta*	*Vt.* II on P. 1.1.47
(4)	*mas°j*	+	*ta*	P. 6.4.24
(5)	*ma°j*	+	*ta*	P. 8.2.29
(6)	*mag*	+	*ta*	P. 8.2.30
(7)	*mag*	+	*na*	P. 8.2.45
	magna.			

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.61 RADHIJABHOR ACI '(*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅgas*) *radhi-* "to subdue" and *jabh-* "to open the jaws wide," if (a suffix beginning with) a vowel follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for two verbal bases on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *radhijabhoḥ* (*aṅgayoḥ*) *aci*. Here *aṅgayoḥ* together with *radhijabhoḥ* is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. *Aṅgayoḥ* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Radhi* is the quotation form by *Vt*. II on P. 3.3.108 of the verbal base mentioned in the *Dhp*. 4.84 as *radhA*. *JabhA* is mentioned in the *Dhp*. 1.415. *AC* is the *pratyāhāra* standing for a vowel. *Radhijabhoḥ* qualifies *aṅgayoḥ*. *Aci* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. It is interpreted to mean *ajādau* by the *tadādividhi*, *Vt*. XXII on P. 1..1.72. It discontinues *jhali* from P. 7.1.60. The word *pratyaye* is understood. Compare P. 7.1.60, under 2. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(A) For *radh-*

randhayati 'he causes to subdue,' *randhakaḥ* 'one who subdues' (sg. nom. masc.), *sādhurandhī* 'one who is habituated to subdue well' (sg. nom. masc.), *randhaṃrandham* 'after having subdued repeatedly' and *randho vartate* 'subjection takes place.'

As explained by the *Nyāsa*, in *randhayati* the suffix added to the verbal base is *ṆiC* by P. 3.1.26; in *randhaka* the suffix is *ṆvuL* by P. 3.1.133, replaced by *aka*, P. 7.1.1; in °*randhin* the suffix is *ṆinI*, by P. 3.2.78; in *randhaṃrandham* the suffix is *ṆamUL*, by P. 3.4.22; in *randha* the suffix is *GhaÑ*, by P. 3.3.18.

(B) For *jabh-*

jambhayati 'he causes to open the jaws wide,' *jambhakaḥ* 'one who opens the jaws wide,' *sādhujambhī* 'one who is habituated to open the jaws wide well,' *jambhaṃjambham* 'after having opened the jaws wide repeatedly' and *jambho vartate* 'opening of the jaws wide takes place.'

4. The *KV* notes that *vṛddhi*, even though it has been prescribed by the later rule (P. 7.2.116), is blocked by *nUM* by the present rule. The reason stated by the *KV* is that P. 7.1.61 is *nitya* 'invariably applicable.' In fact, the *nUM* rule changes the environment of the *vṛddhi* rule (P. 7.2.116) in the sense that due to the insertion of *n* the verbal base vowel *a* is no longer in prefinal position.

5. To point out the significance of the condition *aci* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *raddhā* 'one who subdues' and *jabhyam* 'that of which the jaws are to be opened wide.' The suffix used in *raddhā* is *tṛC*, by P. 3.1.133. The *Padamañjarī* explains that here the augment *iṬ* is optionally not applied, by P. 7.2.45. The *Nyāsa* explains that in the derivation P. 8.2.40 is applied for the substitution of *dh* for the *t* of the suffix, and P. 8.4.53 for the substitution of *d* for the *dh* of the verbal base.

In *jabhya* the *kṛtya* suffix *yaT* is used by P. 3.1.98. For its meaning see P. 3.4.70.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.62 NEṬY ALIṬI RADHEḤ '(*nUM* does) not (become part) of (the verbal base *aṅga*) *radhi* "to subdue," if (a suffix) taking *iṬ* follows immediately, which is not *lIṬ*'

1. This is a *pratisedhasūtra* prohibiting *nUM* for *radh-* on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *iṭi aliṭi radheḥ* (*aṅgasya*). *Iṭi* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. *IṬ* is the augment added at the beginning of a suffix by P. 7.2.35 and P. 1.1.46. *Aliṭi* is another technical locative. The form *aliṭ* is a *nañtatpuruṣa* by P. 2.2.6. *LIṬ* is the marker of the perfect endings by P. 3.2.115. In connection with both *iṭi* and *aliṭi* the word *pratyaye* is understood. *Radhi* is the quotation form by *Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108 of the verbal base *radh-*. See P. 7.1.61, under 2. *Radheḥ* is taken as an

avayavaṣaṣṭhī. The *vidheya* is *na* (*nUM*), where *nUM* is continued from P. 7.1.58. The rule contains two negations. See under 7, below.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *radhitā* 'one who oppresses,' *radhitum* 'in order to be subdued' and *radhitavyam* 'what has to be subdued.' The augment *iṬ* is preferably (*vā*, continued from P. 7.2.44) applied by P. 7.2.45 For the non-preferred form *raddhā* see P. 7.1.61, under 5.

4. To point out the significance of the word *iṭi* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the examples *randhanam* 'subjection' and *randhakaḥ* 'one who subdues' (sg. nom. masc.). Here *iT* is not applied. Being only prohibited before *iṬ*, *nUM* is applied here.

To point out the significance of the word *aliṭi* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *rarandhiva* 'the two of us have subdued' and *rarandhima* 'we have subdued.' These are *lIṬ* forms which take *iṬ*, because the non-addition of *iṬ* is restricted to the *kṛ-ādi* verbal bases enumerated in P. 7.2.13. That is to say, excluding the eight *kṛ-ādi* bases, elsewhere the augment *iṬ* is applied in *lIṬ*.

5. The *KV* notes that once *nUM* has been inserted, there is no *Kittva* of *lIṬ* endings (by P. 1.2.5), because now *randh-* ends in a consonant group. Consequently, the *n* cannot be deleted by P. 6.2.24, which is conditioned by *KṄiti*. Then what about *KvasU*? This is the pf. act. participle suffix introduced by P. 3.2.107. The example is *redhivān* 'having yawned' (sg. nom. masc.). The *prakriyā* is as follows :

(1)	*radhA-*					*Dhp*. 4.84
(2)		*radh*		+ *lIṬ*		P. 3.2.115
(3)		*radh*		+ *KvasU*		P. 3.2.107
(4)	*radh*	+ *radh*		+ *vas*		P. 6.1.8
(5)	*radh*	+ *redh*		+ *vas*		P. 6.4.119
(6)	°	*redh*		+ *vas*		P. 6.4.120
(7)		*redh*	+ *iT*	+ *vas*		P. 7.2.67
(8)		*re-nUM-dh*	+ *i*	+ *vas*		P. 6.4.24
(10)		*redh*	+ *i*	+ *vas*	+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(11)		*redh*	+ *i*	+ *vas*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(12)		*redh*	+ *i*	+ *vans*		P. 7.1.70
(13)		*redh*	+ *i*	+ *vāns*		P. 6.4.10
(14)		*redh*	+ *i*	+ *vān°*		P. 8.2.23
		redhivān.				

In stage (9) the modified verbal base *rendh* ends in a consonant group. Therefore, according to P. 1.2.5, the *lIT* replacement endings cannot be *Kit*. If not *Kit*, then P. 6.4.24 cannot be applied. But *KvasU* is already *Kit* as an *aupadeśika* element. Therefore P. 6.4.24 can be applied.

The *KV* notes that the rule order application is (1) the *e*-substitution and the deletion of the reduplication, (2) the addition of the augment *iṬ*, and (3) the insertion of *nUM*. Thereafter *nUM* is deleted by P. 6.2.24, which is conditioned by *kṅiti*. *KvasU* is *Kit*, as explained above.

6. Finally, referring to Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the rule, the *KV* asks why hasn't the rule been phrased as a restriction (*niyama*) in the form of *iṭi liṭi* (*radheḥ*)? Suppose, we phrase the *niyama* by adding the word *eva* after *liṭi*, so that we have *liṭy eva iṭi na anyatra* 'if (*nUM* is applied) before (a suffix beginning with) *iṬ*, (then) only in the case of *lIṬ* (endings), not elsewhere.' In that case we can justify the forms *rarandhiva* and *rarandhima*, because here we have pf. endings which begin with *iṬ*. The *niyama* also justifies *radhitā*, because *tṛC* is not a pf. ending. Moreover, as the *Nyāsa* explains, P. 7.1.62 would have been phrased in a shorter way without involving two negations. The answer is that, if the rule had been phrased as a *niyama*, the reverse interpretation would be possible also, namely, by adding *eva* after *iti*. In that case, the *niyama* would mean: '(if *nUM*, then) only before a *lIṬ* ending which begins with *iṬ*, not elsewhere.' In that case, we cannot justify the presence of *nUM* in *rarandha* 'he has oppressed,' because the 3rd sg. pf, ending does not begin with *iṬ*, and we cannot justify the absence of *nUM* in *radhitā* 'one who oppresses,' because the suffix *tṛC* falls outside the pf. endings. The conclusion, not stated by the *KV*, is better reject Patañjali's *niyama*-proposal and leave the rule as it is.

7. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Here Patañjali notes that the rule contains two negations, one by *na*, and the other by *aliṭi*. He says that both negations can be done away with by rephrasing the rule as *iṭi liṭi radher na*, and by interpreting *iṭi liṭi* as a *niyama*, in the sense of *liṭy eva iḍādau na anyasmin*. See under 6, above.

7.1.63 RABHER AŚAPLIṬOḤ '(*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅga*) *rabh-* "to act with force," (if a suffix beginning with a vowel follows immediately,) except before *ŚaP* or *lIṬ*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *rabh-*, on the condition stated and with the exception stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *rabher* (*aṅgasya aci*) *aśabliṭoḥ*. Here *rabhi* is the quotation form by *Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108 of the verbal base quoted as *rabhA* in the *Dhp.* 1.1023. It is usually connected with the preverb *ā*, and then conveys the sense of 'beginning, undertaking.' *Rabheḥ* is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P.6.4.1. *Aci* is the condition continued from P. 7.1.61. *Aśabliṭoḥ* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. formed of a negated *dvandva* cp. It discontinues *iṭy aliṭi* of P. 7.1.62. *ŚaP* is the general *vikaraṇa* introduced by P. 3.1.68. *LIṬ* is the marker of the pf. endings, defined by P. 3.2.115. The negation *na* of P. 7.1.62 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. See *FANU*, p. 274, convention 39. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *ārambhayati* 'he undertakes,' *ārambhakaḥ* 'one who undertakes' (sg. nom. masc.), *sādhvārambhī* 'one who is habituated to undertake well' (sg. nom. masc.), *ārambhamārambham* 'after having undertaken repeatedly' and *ārambho vartate* 'undertaking takes place.' For the pattern of examples see P. 7.1.61, under 3.

4. To point out the significance of the condition *aśabliṭoḥ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *ārabhate* 'he takes hold of' and *ārebhe* 'he has taken hold of.' In *ārabhate ŚaP* is used, and *ārebhe* is a *lIṬ* form. For *etva* and *abhyāsalopa* apply P. 6.4.120. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the pf. ending *-e* is substituted for *ta* by P. 3.4.8. The *ātm.* endings are by P. 1.3.12.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.64 LABHEŚ CA 'also (*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅga*) *labh-* "to take hold of" (if a suffix beginning with a vowel follows immediately, except before *ŚaP* or *lIṬ*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *labh-*, on the condition stated and with the exception stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *labheḥ* (*aṅgasya aci aśabliṭoḥ*). Here *labhi* is the quotation form by *Vt.* II on P. 3.3.108 of the verbal base quoted as *ḌUlabhAṢ* in the *Dhp.* 1.1024. For the function of *ḌU* see P. 7.1.60, under 2. The function of *Ṣ* is defined by P. 3.3.104. *Labheḥ* is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. The word *aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Aci* is continued from P. 7.1.61. *Aśabliṭoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.63. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

Ca serves as a boundary marker. See *FANU*, p. 36, 232.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *lambhayati* 'he causes to take hold of,' *lambhakaḥ* 'one who takes hold of' (sg. nom. masc.), *sādhulambī* 'one who is habituated to take hold of well' (sg. nom. masc.), *lambhaṃlambham* 'after having taken hold of repeatedly' and *lambho vartate* 'taking hold of takes place.' For the pattern of the examples see P. 7.1.61, under 3.

4. To point out the siginificance of the word *aśabliṭoḥ* continued in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *labhate* 'he takes hold of' and *lebhe* 'he has taken hold of.' In *labhate ŚaP* is used. *Lebhe* is a *lIṬ* form. *Etva* and *abhyāsalopa* are by P. 6.4.120. The *ātm.* endings are added by P. 1.3.12.

To point out the significance of the word *aci* continued in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *labdhā* 'one who takes hold of.' The suffix used is *tṛC* by P. 3.1.133. As is clear, it does not begin with a vowel. The augment *iṬ* is not added, by P. 7.2.10.

5. The *KV* finally says that P. 7.1.64 is presented as a separate rule for the sake of the next rule. The point is that *labh-* only is needed in the next rule, not *rabh-* and *labh-* together.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.65 ĀṄO YI '(*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅga labh-* "to take hold of" following after (the preverb) *āṄ*, in the domain of application of (a suffix which begins with) *y*'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *ālabh-*, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *āṅaḥ* (*labheḥ aṅgasya*) *yi*. Here *āṅah* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. For the construction *āṅah* + verbal base compare P. 1.3.20 and 28. *ĀṄ* is used in A. both as a preverb and as a *karmapravacanīya* (P. 2.3.10). See further *AP* III, P. 1.3.20, under 5. *Labheḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.64. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.1.4. *Yi* is a *viṣayasaptamī*, not a *parasaptamī*. Traditionally, a *viṣayasaptamī* does not require the presence of a particular sufffix for the operation concerned to go ahead. See *AP* V, P. 2.1.51, under 8. For the reason why *yi* is taken as *viṣayasaptamī* see under 7, below. *Yi* is interpreted to mean *y-ādau* by the *tadādividhi* (*Vt.* XXII on P. 1.1.72). The word *pratyaye* is understood. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

Actually, the assumption of a *viṣayasaptamī* is made superfluous by the extended version of the *siddha*-principle, when two rules are involved. Hereby rule A which is applicable earlier on in the *prakriyā* than rule B, but whose *nimitta* will be destroyed by rule B, is not applied. See P. 7.1.23, under 6 and 7. In our case, the subsequent application of the *nUM*-rule (P. 7.1.65, rule B) destroys the *nimitta* of the *yaT*-rule (P. 3.1.97, rule A), which requires the *a* of *labh* to be in prefinal position. Therefore the *yaT*-rule is not applied, but the *ṆyaT*-rule (P. 3.2.124) is.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV*, are *ālambhyā gauḥ* 'a cow which is to be taken hold of,' borrowed from Patañjali, and *ālambhyā vaḍavā* 'a mare which is to be taken hold of.' The *n* is replaced by *anusvāra* by P. 8.3.24, and then by *m* by P. 8.4.58.

4. With regard to the word *ālambhyā*, following Patañjali's *bhāṣya*, the *KV* raises the question of accentuation. The *KV* says that, once *nUM* has become part of *labh-* before the suffix is added, the verbal base vowel will lose its status of being the prefinal sound. The position then is *ālambh-*. Here we cannot apply the suffix *yaT* by P. 3.1.97, because this rule requires the verbal base vowel to be in prefinal position. Instead, we will apply the suffix *ṆyaT* by P. 3.1.124. But that involves a difference in accent. If *ṆyaT* is added, the original accent will be *(jātya-)svarita* by P. 6.1.185. That accent is retained by P. 6.2.139. This rule says that in a *tp.* cp. showing the sequence *gati* + verbal base + *kṛt* suffix, like *ālambhyā* (as in *ālambhyā gauḥ* 'the cow is to be taken hold of'), the original accent (*prakṛtisvara*) is retained. The *KV* here uses the term *kṛduttarapadaprakṛtisvara* 'the original accent of the second cp. member which ends in a *kṛt* suffix.' The second member in our case is *lambhyā*. It has the *(jātya-)svarita* accent on *yā*. As explained by Patañjali, this is the desired accent of *ālambhyā*.

On the other hand, if *nUM* is not inserted into *labh* before the suffix is added, the position is *ālabh-*. Here the *a* is the prefinal sound. Therefore we will apply the suffix *yaT* by P. 3.1.97. The augment *nUM* is inserted afterwards. If *yaT* is added, the accent would be *ādyudātta* of the *kṛduttarapada* by P. 6.1.213. The same accent is retained again by P. 6.2.139. Thus we would derive *ālámbhyā*. This accent is not desired.

5. To point out the significance of the word *āṄ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *labhyam* 'what is to be taken hold of.'

6. How to justify the expression *ālabhya* used in the ritual belonging to the *Agniṣṭoma* sacrifice? The answer is that in the Vedic language all rules are

optional. See *Mbh.* I, p. 315, line 6, which is followed by an enumeration of instances. Alternatively, we will say that in *ālabhya*, after *nUM* has been inserted, deletion of the prefinal nasal is applied by P. 6.4.24, considering that the following suffix is *Kit* or *Ṅit*.

7. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. The first question raised by Patañjali is, why is the present rule not applied in *ālabhyate* 'it is taken hold of'? Why not *ālambhyate*? The passive marker is *yaK* (P. 3.1.67), which begins with *y*. The answer is that in the *upadeśa*-stage *nUM* has already been applied. See P. 7.1.58, under 5. *NUM* is subsequently deleted by P. 6.4.24.

Then Patañjali quotes the example *ālambhyā gauḥ* '(a cow) which is to be taken hold of.' Here, once the suffix *yaT* by P. 3.1.97 has taken up its position, *nUM* is inserted. *Labh-* ends in a *pU-varga* sound, and the *a* occurs in prefinal position. So, what is wrong here? The difficulty is that in *ālambhyā* the second member *lambhyā* now will have the *udātta* accent on the vowel of *lambh*, by P. 6.1.213, and that will be retained by P. 6.2.139. But what we want is the *(jātya-)svarita* accent of the syllable *yā* by P. 6.1.185, and have that retained by P. 6.2.139. Patañjali removes the difficulty by referring to the statement that *nUM* has been prescribed already in the *upadeśa* stage. Reference is to *Vt.* I on P. 7.1.58. That is to say, we do not first add *yaT* and then insert *nUM*, but *nUM* is already there before any grammatical operation can be applied. Therefore, since *yaT* by P. 3.1.97 cannot be applied, we must apply *ṆyaT* by P. 3.1.124. In this way, accent bears out the position taken by P. 7.1.58, namely, that *nUM* is to be added already in the *upadeśa* stage. This is also why *yi* in the present rule is taken as a *viṣayasaptamī*. The assumption of a *parasaptamī* would imply that *nUM* is introduced in the *prakriyā* after the suffix *yaT* has been added. But that goes against P. 7.1.58.

Since in both cases, whether we add *yaT* or *ṆyaT*, the syllable *yā* of *ālambhyā* has the *svarita* accent, one may ask whether there is any difference. The answer is yes, there is a difference in the character of the *svarita*. The accent sequence in *ā* + *lambh* + *yaT* is *anudātta-udātta-anudātta*. In this sequence, by P. 8.4.66, the final *anudātta* is replaced by *svarita*. This *svarita* is known as *pracayasvarita*, dependent circumflex, see Whitney, § 85. However, the accent sequence in *ā* + *lambh* + *ṆyaT* is *anudātta* + *anudātta* + *svarita*. Here the *svarita* is a *jātyasvarita*, called independent circumflex by Whitney. In both cases we have to take into account P. 6.1.158, which says that a *pada* is *anudātta* with the exception of one syllable which may have *udātta* or *svarita*.

7.1.66 UPĀT PRAŚAṂŚĀYĀM '(*nUM* becomes part of the verbal base *aṅga labh-* "to take hold of") following after (the preverb) *upa*, (when the question is of adding a suffix which begins with *y*,) if the sense of *praśaṃśā* "praise" is to be conveyed'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *upalabh-* on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśys* is *upāt* (*labheḥ aṅgasya yi*). *Upāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. For *upa* see P. 7.1.65, under 2, in connection with *āṄ*. *Upāt* discontinues *ānah* from P. 7.1.65. The word *labheḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.64. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Yi* is continued from P. 7.4.65. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*) *praśaṃśāyām*. Here *nUM* is continued from P. 7.1.58. *Praśaṃśāyām* is considered to be part of the *vidheya*, because it is an output meaning. See *AP* IX, P. 6.4.60, under 2.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *upalambhyā bhavatā vidyā* 'knowledge is to be acquired (as a praiseworthy thing) by you, sir,' *upalambhyāni dhanāni* 'wealth is to be acquired (as a praiseworthy thing).' The *KV* adds that here the suffix *ṆyaT* is used (by P. 3.1.124), and that, therefore, the accent of the form ending in the suffix *ṆyaT* is (*jātya-*)*svarita* only (by P. 6.1.85, retained by P. 6.2.139). Compare P. 7.1.65, under 4.

4. To point out the significance of the condition *praśaṃśāyām*, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *upalabhyam asmād vṛṣalāt kiṃcit* 'something has to be acquired from an outcaste.' Here *upalabhya* ends in the suffix *yaT* because the *a* of *upalabh-* occurs in prefinal position and is followed by a sound belonging to the *pU-varga*. Reference is to P. 3.1.98. The accented form will be *upalábhya*, by P. 6.1.213.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.67 UPASARGĀT KHALGHAÑOḤ '(*nUM* becomes part of the verbal base *aṅga labh-* "to take hold of") following after a preverb, if (the suffixes) *KHaL* or *GHaÑ* follow immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *labh-* preceded by a preverb, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *upasargāt* (*labheḥ aṅgasya*) *khalgañoḥ*. *Upasargāt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. *Upasarga* is the term for the *prādi* particles enumerated by P. 1.4.58 and defined by P. 1.4.59 as *kriyāyoge* 'when there is connection with an

action.' It discontinues *upāt* from P. 6.1.67. *Labheḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.64. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *KHaL* is the suffix prescribed by P. 3.3.126 after a verbal base which is preceded by *īṣat* or *dus* or *su* in the senses of 'difficult to be done' or 'easy to be done' respectively. *GHaÑ* is the suffix prescribed by P. 3.3.18 in the sense of *bhāva* 'action noun.' The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *KHal*

īṣatpralambhaḥ 'difficult to be deceived' (sg. nom. masc.), *supralambhaḥ* 'easy to be deceived' (sg. nom. masc.) and *duṣpralambhaḥ* 'difficult to be deceived' (sg. nom. masc.).

(2) For *GHaÑ*

pralambhaḥ 'deception' and *vipralambhaḥ* 'deceit.'

4. The *KV* notes that we could have managed already (by P. 7.1.64), and that, therefore, the present rule has the character of a *niyama* 'restrictive rule.' The *KV* explains this by saying *upasargād eva labheḥ khalgañoḥ parato numāgamo bhavati na anyatra* 'the augment *nUM* becomes part of *labh-* followed by *KHaL* or *GHaÑ* only when it is preceded by an *upasarga*, not otherwise.' The examples are *īṣal-labhyaḥ* 'difficult to be obtained' and *lābho vartate* 'there is gain.' Here *nUM* is not applied.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.68 NA SUDURBHYĀṂ KEVALĀBHYĀM '(*nUM* does) not (become part of the verbal base *anga labh-*, when *KHaL* or *GHaÑ* follow immediately), if (*labh-*) comes after (the *upasargas*) *su* "easy" or *dus* "bad, difficult" separately'

1. This is a *pratiṣedhasūtra* prohibiting the augment *nUM* for *labh-* followed by *KHaL* or *GHaÑ* on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*labheḥ aṅgasya khalgañoḥ*) *sudurbhyām* (*upasargābhyām*) *kevalābhyām*. Here *labheḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.64. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Khalgañoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.67. *Sudurbhyām* is a technical abl. (dual) by P. 1.1.67. The *KV*, following Patañjali, takes *sudurbhyām* as a dual instr. See further under 6. We have, however, taken *sudurbhyām* as an abl., because in the

A. the order of linguistic elements is nearly always indicated by a loc. or abl., not by an instr. The rule *saha supā* (P. 2.1.4) forms an exception. *Su* is mentioned in the *prādi-gaṇa* (no. 47 in Böhtlingk's edition of the *Gaṇapāṭha*), and *dus* is mentioned in the *prādi-gaṇa* (no. 17 in Böhtlingk's edition). For *KHaL* and *GHaÑ* see P. 7.1.57, under 2. *Upasargābhyām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.67. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*) *na*. Here *nUM* is continued from P. 7.1.58.

The prohibition of *nUM* by the present rule amounts to this: (1) *labh-* must be followed by *KhaL* or *GHaÑ*, and (2) *labh-* must be preceded by *su* or *dus* only, whether singly or in combination.There should not be any other preverb.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *KhaL*

sudurlabham 'very difficult to be obtained' (sg. nom. ntr.) and *sulabham* 'easy to be obtained' (sg. nom. ntr.)

(2) For *GHaÑ* (action noun)

sulābhaḥ 'an easy gain' and *durlābhaḥ* 'a difficult gain'

4. To point out the significance of the word *kevalābhyām* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *supralambhaḥ* 'an easy deception' and *duṣpralambhaḥ* 'a difficult deception'.

5. The *KV* finally says that the word *kevala* is used assuming that *sudurbhyām* is an instrumental. If it is assumed to be an abl., there would be no chance for P. 7.1.68 to apply, because a technical abl. requires immediate sequence of the elements concerned, and in *supralambham* that sequence is disturbed by the intervention of *pra*. See further under 6.

6. We have one *Vt*. on the rule. It says that the mention of *kevala* in connection with *su* and *dus* is for the sake of prohibiting other preverbs preceding or following *su* or *dus*. The following discussion is concerned with showing that the mention of *kevala* in P. 7.1.68 makes good sense. Patañjali first provides the counterexample *prasulambham*. Here, since *su* occurs together with another preverb, namely, *pra*, we can justify the non-prohibition of *nUM* on account of the word *kevala*. The augment is applied by P. 6.1.67. But this form is not found in usage. The sequence *prasu*° is not used in Sanskrit. Therefore it is not a good

counterexample for P. 7.1.68. A better counterexample appears to be *supralambham* 'easy to be deceived' (sg. nom. ntr.). Here also the prohibition of *nUM* is not applied. But, again, there is a difficulty. The text of the P. 7.1.68 says *sudurbhyām*. If this is taken as an abl. in the technical sense by P. 1.1.67, it requires immediate sequence, namely, of *su* and *dus* with the following *kṛt*-derivative. But in the counterexample just quoted *pra* intervenes between *su* and *lambham*. The next counterexample offered is *atisulambham* 'extremely easy to be deceived' (sg. nom. ntr.). That also runs into difficulties. *Ati* is not called *upasarga*, but *karmapravacanīya* in the sense of *pūjā* 'praise' by P. 1.4.94. This being so, we cannot apply the *nUM*-prohibition by P. 7.1.68, because in this rule *upasargāt* from P. 7.1.67 is continued. Then Patañjali returns to *supralambham*. To get rid of the difficulty of the technical abl. mentioned above, Patañjali suggests that *sudurbhyām* in the rule should be taken as a du. instr. Accordingly, the construction of the rule is *sudurbhyām upasṛṣṭasya labheḥ* '(*nUM* becomes part) of *labh-* which is connected with the preverbs *su* or *dus*.' This is also how the *KV* explains the rule. In this case, there is no requirement of immediate sequence, and *pra* can come in between.

In *supralambham* the *nUM*-prohibition by P. 7.1.68 does not apply. It does not apply, because *labh* is not solely preceded by *su*. It also does not apply, because *labh* is not immediately preceded by *sU*. So *nUM* is added. Therefore *supralambham* is a fitting counterexample of P. 7.1.68, and there is no need for Patañjali's proposal to regard *sudurbhyām kevalābhyām* as an instr.

7.1.69 VIBHĀṢĀ CIṆṆAMULOḤ '(*nUM* becomes) preferably (part of the verbal base *aṅga labh-* "to take hold of,") if *CiṆ* or *ṆamUL* follow immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing preference of *nUM* for *labh-* on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*labheḥ aṅgasya*) *ciṇṇamuloḥ*. Here *labheḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.64. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Ciṇṇamuloḥ* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.67. It discontinues *khalgañoḥ* from P. 7.1.67. *CiṆ* replaces *ClI* by P. 3.1.66, when the pass. aor, 3rd sg. is formed. See Whitney, §§ 843-844. *ṆamUL* is the suffix prescribed by P. 3.4.22 in the sense of *ābhikṣṇya* 'repetition (of action)'. The *anubandha* *Ḷ* is indicative of the *udātta* accent of the syllable preceding *am* by P. 6.1.193. *Sudurbhyāṃ kevalābhyam* from P. 7.1.68 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*. Its continuation in the present rule makes no sense.

How to formulate the *vidheya*? That depends on whether *na* from P. 7.1.68 is continued, or not. In the first case the *vidheya* will be (*na*) *vibhāṣā* (*num*), in the

second case it will be *vibhāṣā* (*num*). *Na vibhāṣā* amounts to *vā*, and that is reflected in the translation of the rule stated above. But the *KV* does not continue *na*.

According to Kiparsky 1979, p. 142, *na* is continued in the present rule. Thus the preferred forms should show *nUM*. Earlier, on p. 44, Kiparsky had raised the question whether *na* is supposed to be continued in an optional rule. On. p. 45 he phrases the principle that *na*, *vā* and other qualifiers are continued only if there is some indication to that effect. What Kiparsky means by indication is explained on p. 45-47. The relevant indication is stated under (3), on p. 46-47. The clearer idea is stated in *FANU*, p. 274, convention 40. It says that the condition for the continuation of *na* in the next rule is that the same process is continued. In our case, the process is the application of *nUM* to *labh-* which started in P. 7.1.64.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *CiṆ*

alābhi / alambhi 'it was taken hold of.' Here *alambhi* is the preferred form. The *vṛddhi* in *alābhi* is by P. 7.2.116, which is conditioned by *upadhāyāḥ* 'in place of the prefinal (vowel).' The finite verb ending *ta* (*ātm*) is deleted by P. 6.4.104.

(2) For *ṆamUL*

lābhaṃlābham / lambhaṃlambham, 'after having repeatedly taken hold of.' Here *lambhaṃlambham* is the preferred form. *Vṛddhi* again by P. 7.2.116.

4. The *KV* notes that the *vibhāṣā* is of the *vyavasthita* 'limited' type. That is to say, the option is subject to restriction. According to the *KV*, the option regards *labh-* when not connected with a preverb. Thus here we may or may not add *nUM*. But when *labh-* is connected with a preverb, *nUM* is invariably added. The examples borrowed from Patañjali are *prālambhi* 'he was deceived' for the option in which *nUM* is allowed, and *pralambham* 'deceiving' (sg. nom. ntr.) for the invariable use of *nUM*. We note that this discussion on *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* is due to the traditional misunderstanding regarding the continuation of *na* in a rule containing an option word.

5. We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It says that in the rule *ciṇṇamuloḥ* the word *anupasṛṣṭasya* 'of (*labhi*) when not preceded by a preverb' should be stated. Patañjali quotes the examples *prālambhi* for *CiṆ*, and *pralambhampralambham* 'after

having deceived repeatedly' for *ṆamUL*. Here *nUM* is obligatorily added by P. 7.1.64.

The *Vt.* is not really required, because everywhere *nUM*-forms are the preferred usage.

Patañjali then rejects the *Vt.* His reason is that the word *upasargāt* is continued from P. 7.1.67. Moreover, he wants to continue *na* from P. 7.1.68 also. The result is that P. 7.1.69 contains two *vidheyas*, one with *na num upsargāt*, and the other with *num vibhāṣā*. Who will believe that? Therefore the *Vt.* should be retained.

7.1.70 UGIDACĀṂ SARVANĀMASTHĀNE 'DHĀTOḤ '(*nUM* becomes part) of (an *aṅga*) which is not a verbal base, having an *uK*-letter by way of *anubandha*, and of *añc*- "to bend," if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for an *aṅga* marked with *U* which is not a verbal base, and for *añc*-, which is a verbal base *aṅga*, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ugidacām* (*aṅgānām*) *sarvanāmasthāne adhātoḥ*. Here *ugidacām* is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. The word *ugit* refers to a linguistic element which is provided with a sound included in the *pratyāhāra uK* serving as an *anubandha*. *UK* also includes the vowel *R*. *Añc*- is the verbal base quoted as *añcU*- in the *Dhp*.1.203. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmasthāna* is the name given to particular case endings enumerated in P. 1.1.42-43. Before *sarvanāmasthāna* endings the *ugit aṅgas* end in the consonant group *nt*. *Sarvanāmasthāne* discontinues the condition *ciṇṇamuloḥ* from P. 7.1.69. *Adhātoḥ* is the statement of an exception. See *AP*, p. 131. See *AP* VII, p. 131. It qualifies the constituent *ugit* in *ugidacām*. The construction, therefore, is *ugitaḥ* (*aṅgasya*) *adhātoḥ*. The same form *adhātoḥ* is used in P. 6.4.14, also at the end of the rule. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

Why is *na vibhāṣa* from P. 7.1.69 not continued in the present rule? In the first place, we note that P. 7.1.70 no longer deals with *nUM* for *labh*-. Thus the process, that is, the *vidheya* together with the linguistic element to which it applies, is changed. See *FANU*, p. 274, convention 40. In the second place, prohibition means that a particular rule is prohibited from applying. But we cannot show such a particular rule in the case of P. 7.1.70 when taken as a prohibition. Therefore it cannot be a prohibition, or, in other words, *na* cannot be continued in P. 7.1.70.

As regards *vibhāṣā*, we refer to *FANU*, p. 273, convention 24, which says that the option words are continued as long as the same process is continued. In fact, for the continuation of *na* and the option words *vā*, etc., the same convention holds. They are continued as long as the same process continues.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(a) For *ugit* forms

(i) *bhavatU* see *AP* IX, p. 36, derivation, and p. 35 for *atU* forms.

bhavān 'you, sir,' *bhavantau* 'the two of you, sirs' and *bhavantaḥ* 'you, sirs' (pl.)

For the derivation of *bhavān* see *AP* IX, p. 36.

(ii) *īyasUN* (by P. 5.3.57)

śreyān 'the better one' (sg. nom. masc.), *śreyāṃsau* 'the two better ones' and *śreyāṃsaḥ* 'the better ones' (pl.)

For the derivation of *śreyān* see *AP* IX, p. 20.

(iii) *ŚatR* (by P. 3.2.124; *ŚatR* is *ugit*)

pacan 'a cooking one' (sg. nom. masc.) *pacantau* 'the two cooking ones' and *pacantaḥ* 'the cooking ones' (pl.)

(b) For *añc-*

prāṅ 'the eastern one' (sg. nom. masc.), *prāñcau* 'the two eastern ones' and *prāñcaḥ* 'the eastern ones' (pl.).

The derivation of *prāṅ*, in essence stated by the *Nyāsa*, is as follows :

(1)	*añcU*		*Dhp.* 1.203
(2)	*añc*	+ *KviN*	P. 3.2.59
(3)	*pra* + *añc*	+ *vi*	
(4)	*pra* + *ac*	+ *vi*	P. 6.4.42
(4)	*prāc*	+ *vi*	P. 6.1.101

(5)	*prāc*	+ °		P. 6.1.67
(6)	*prāc*		+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(7)	*prāc*	+ °	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(8)	*prā-nUM-c*			P. 7.1.70
(9)	*prān°*			P. 8.2.23
(10)	*prāṅ*			P .8.2.62
	prāñ.			

4. To point out the significance of the word *ugidacām* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *dṛṣat* 'a rock' (sg. nom.), *dṛṣadau* 'two rocks' and *dṛṣadaḥ* 'rocks' (pl.). *Dṛṣad* is not derived as an *ugit* form in the Pāṇinian system.

To point out the significance of the word *sarvanāmasthāne*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *bhavataḥ paśya* 'look at you, sirs' and *śreyasaḥ paśya* 'look at the better ones.'

5. Following Patañjali the *KV* says that the mention of the verbal base *añc-* in the rule is for the sake of *niyama* 'restriction.' The *niyama* is phrased as *añcater eva dhātor anyatra mā bhūt* '(*nUM* becomes part) of the verbal base *añc-* only, so that it is not inserted elsewhere,' that is, in other verbal bases. The examples for the *niyama*, borrowed from Patañjali, are *ukhāsrat* 'one who drops (something) into the boiling pan' (sg.nom. masc.) and *parṇadhvat* 'one who drops leaves' (sg. nom. masc.). The examples have been quoted earlier in connection with P. 3.2.76.

°*Srat* and *dhvat* are derivations of the *ugit* verbal bases *sraṃsU-* and *dhvaṃsU* mentioned in the *Dhp.* 1.420 and 1.793. The *prakriyā* of *ukhāsrat* is as follows :

(1)	((*ukhā* + *Ṅi*) + *sraṃsU*))	+ *KviP*		P. 3.2.76
(2)	((*ukhā* + °) + *sraṃs*))	+ *vi*		P. 2.4.71
(3)	*ukhāsrams*	+ °		P. 6.1.67
(4)	*ukhāsra°s*			P. 6.4.24
(5)	*ukhāsras*		+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(6)	*ukhāsras*		+ °	P. 6.1.68
(7)	*ukhāsrad*			P. 8.2.72
(8)	*ukhāsrat*			P. 8.4.56 (*vā*)
	ukhāsrat.			

Since *sraṃs-* and *dhvaṃs-* are original verbal bases, *nUM* by P. 7.1.70 is not allowed. Thus we can avoid the undesired forms **ukhāsrand* and **parṇadhvand*

where the final *d* will be deleted by P. 8.2.23.

6. What is the point in mentioning *adhātoḥ*? The *KV*, following Patañjali, says that it has been mentioned so that *nUM* does not become part of a verbal base which previously was not a *dhātu* 'verbal base.' See further under 7.

7. We have one *Vt*. on the rule. It says that because of the mention of *añc-* in the *ugit*-rule (P. 7.1.70) *adhātoḥ* is an (already) established fact. That is to say, what the *sūtrakāra* wanted to achieve by saying *adhātoḥ* has already been achieved by the statement of *ugit*. Therefore *adhātoḥ* is not required in the rule.

Patañjali disagrees. He explains that the mention of *añc-* is for the sake of a *niyama* 'restriction.' *AñcU-* is itself *ugit*, so why mention it separately? That can only be purposeful, if it is assumed that the mention is meant to give us a clue. The clue is that *añc-* is mentioned for the sake of restriction. That is to say, if *nUM* is applied to verbal bases which are *ugit*, it is applied to *añc-* only. Then, since other verbal bases are excluded, why state *adhātoḥ*? The answer is that it is meant to narrow down the field of verbal bases to original verbal bases, so that denominative bases are excluded. The example is *gomatyati* derived in the sense of *gomantam icchati* 'he wants one possessing cattle for himself,' by P. 3.1.8. Here we have a denominative verbal base derived from what previously was not a verbal base, but a noun, namely, *gomat*, a *matUP* formation by P. 5.2.94. The suffix *matUP* is *ugit*.

The derivation of *gomat-* as a verbal base is as follows :

(1)	(*gomat* + *am*) + *KyaC*		P. 3.1.8
(2)	(*gomat* + °) + *ya*		P. 2.4.71; 3.1.32
(3)	*gomatya*	+ *KviP*	P. 3.2.76
(4)	*gomat*°	+ *v*	P. 4.4.48; 6.4.50 (*vibhāṣā*)

Here tradition usually assumes a deletion in two stages, of *a* by P. 6.4.48, and of *y* by P. 6.4.50. But *ya* can be deleted as a whole also, see *AP* IX, p. 153, 155,

(5)	*gomat*	+ °	P. 6.1.67

Here *gomat* has the status of both a noun and of verbal base, the latter according to the maxim *kvibantaṃ dhātutvaṃ na jahati* 'a form ending in *KviP* does not lose its status of *dhātu*'. The maxim has been mentioned in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*,

p. 43 (no. 132) and p. 110 (no. 105). See also *AP* IX, p. 225. The derivation of *gomān* then continues.

(6)	(*gomat*	+ *v*) + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(7)	(*gomat*	+ °) + s	P. 6.1.67
(8)	*gomat*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(9)	*gomant*		P. 7.1.70
(10)	*gomānt*		P. 6.4.14
(11)	*gomān°*		P. 8.2.23
	gomān.		

Obviously, this is very much a roundabout and tricky way of deriving *gomān*, devised by Patañjali only to justify his rejection of *Vt*. Thus, according to Patañjali, the mention of *adhātoḥ* in P. 7.1.70 is purposeful. Its purpose is not to exclude verbal bases like *gomat*, which previously were not verbal bases, but an *ugit* nominal stem, from the purview of P. 7.1.70. To such *ugit* words *nUM* is applicable.

7.1.71 YUJER ASAMĀSE '(*nUM* becomes part) of (the verbal base *aṅga*) *yuji-* "to yoke," (if a *sarvanāsthāna* ending follows immediately,) except when (*yuj* is part of) a compound'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *yuj-* on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*sarvanāmasthāne*) *yujer* (*aṅgasya*). Here *sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.70. *Yuji* is the quotation form by *Vt*. II on P. 3.3.108 of the verbal base quoted as *yujIR* in the *Dhp*.7.7. For the function of *IR* see P. 3.1.57. See also *AP* III, P. 1.3.7, under 5. *Yujeḥ* is taken as an *avayavasaṣṭhī*. It discontinues *ugidacām* from P. 7.1.70. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P.6.4.1.The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The examples quotes by the *KV* are *yuṅ* 'one who yokes,' *yuñjau* 'the two who yoke' and *yuñjaḥ* 'the ones who yoke.' These are *KviN* derivation by P. 3.2.59. The *prakriyā* of *yuṅ* is as follows :

(1)	*yujIR*			*Dhp*. 7.7
(2)	*yuj*	+ *KviN*		P. 3.2.59
(3)	*yuj*	+ *v*	+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(4)	*yuj*	+ °	+ *s°*	P. 6.1.67

(5) *yu-nUM-j*	+ s	P. 7.1.71
(6) *yunj*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(7) *yun°*		P. 8.2.23
(8) *yuṅ*		P. 8.2.62
yuṅ.		

4. To point out the significance of the word *asamāse* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *aśvayuk* 'one who yokes horses,' *aśvayujau* 'the two who yoke horses' and *aśvayujaḥ* 'the ones who yoke horses.' These are *upapada* cps. by P. 2.2.19 in which *nUM* is not inserted. The *prakriyā* of *aśvayuk* is as follows :

(1) ((*aśva* + *am*) + (*yuj* + *KviP*))		P 3.2.61; 2.2.19
(2) ((*aśva* + °) + (*yuj* + °))		P. 2.4.71; 6.1.67
(3) *aśvayuj*	+ *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(4) *aśvayuj*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(5) *aśvayuk*		P. 8.2.30
aśvayuk.		

5. Finally, the *KV* makes it clear that the verbal base *yuj-* meant in the present rule is not the homonymous base *yuj-* mentioned in the *Dhp.* 4.68 in the sense of *samādhi* 'concentrating the mind.' The example quoted is *yujam āpannā ṛṣayah* 'the *ṛṣis* are sunk in contemplation.' Here in *yujam nUM* is not applied.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.72 NAPUṂSAKASYA JHALACAḤ '(*nUM* becomes part) of a neuter nominal *aṅga*) which ends in a *jhaL* sound or in a vowel, (if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for neuter nouns ending in a *jhaL* sound or in a vowel, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ* (*aṅgasya*) *sarvanāmasthāne*. Here *napuṃsakasya* is an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. For the term *napuṃsaka* see P. 7.1.19, under 2. *Jhalacaḥ* qualifies *napuṃsakasya* and is interpreted to mean *jhalajantasya* 'of (an *aṅga*) ending in a *jhaL* sound or in a vowel' by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Jhal* is the *pratyāhāra* of non-nasal consonants and non-nasal semivowels. *AC* is the *pratyāhāra* of all vowels. *Napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ* discontinues *yujeḥ* from P. 7.1.71. *Sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.70. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

For the insertion of *n* in nominal stems in general see Whitney, § 257.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are neuter pl. forms, as follows:

(A) For *jhalanta* stems

udaśvinti 'quantities of buttermilk,' *śakṛnti* 'faeces,' *yaśāṃsi* 'famous deeds' and *payāṃsi* 'quantities of milk / water.' The *Nyāsa* explains that vowel lengthening in the latter two examples is by P. 6.4.10. *NUM* is replaced by *anusvāra* by P. 8.3.24. In the first two examples the *anusvāra* is replaced by a *parasavarṇa* sound, by P. 8.4.58. In the latter two examples this does not happen because of the condition *yayi* in P. 8.4.58.

(B) For *ajanta* stems

kuṇḍāni 'pitchers, pits' *vanāni* 'forests,' *trapūṇi* 'tin objects' and *jatūni* 'objects covered with lac.' Lengthening is by P. 6.4.8.

4. To point out the significance of the word *napuṃsakasya* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *agnicid brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a brahmin who arranges the sacri-ficial fire.'

To point out the significance of *jhalacaḥ*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *bahupuri* 'those which have many cities,' *bahudhuri* 'those which have many yokes,' *vimaladivi* 'those which have a clear sky,' *catvāri ahāni* 'four days.' In these examples the stem ends in *r*, *v* or *n*, which are not *jhaL* sounds. The final *i* is the neuter pl. ending *Śi* (P. 7.1.20). The *Nyāsa* explains that in the first two examples the *samāsānta* suffix *a* is not added to *pur* and *dhur* by P. 5.4.74, considering that a *samāsānta* rule is not invariably applicable. See *PN*, *pbh.* 84. The *v* in °*divi* is a labiodental sound, not included in *jhaL*. In *catvāri* the augment *āM* is inserted after the last vowel by P. 7.1.98.

5. Referring to *Vts.* I and II, the *KV* notes that in the case of a neuter stem which is both *ugit* and *jhalanta* or *ajanta* P. 7.1.72 is to be applied for inserting *nUM*, and not P. 7.1.70, because P. 7.1.72 is the later rule. Reference is to the conflict procedure laid down by P. 1.4.2 and traditionally accepted to apply throughout the A. See *AP* IV, p. 14. The examples are *sreyāṃsi* 'better things,' *bhūyāṃsi* 'more abundant things' and *kurvanti* (*brāhmanakulāṇi*) '(brahmin families) who work' and *kṛṣanti brāhmaṇakulāni* 'brahmin families who plough.' All three examples are

borrowed from Patañjali. For the *kurvanti*, etc. example compare *Mbh.* III, p. 264, line 23. Here the *KV* supplies the word *brāhmaṇakulāni*. See further under 7.

6. The *KV* then refers to *Vt.* IV and V on the rule, for which see below. The examples quoted are borrowed from Patañjali.

7. We have five *Vts* on the rule. *Vt.* I says that in the rule prescribing *nUM* for an *aṅga* ending in a *jhaL* sound or in a vowel a prohibition of *nUM* by the *ugit*-rule (P. 7.1.70) should be stated Patañjali quotes the examples *gomanti brāhmaṇakulāni* 'brahmin families who possess cattle,' *śreyāṃsi* 'better things' and *bhūyāṃsi* 'more abundant things.'

The derivation of *gomanti* is as follows :

(1)	*gomat*	+ *Jas*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*gomat*	+ *Śi*	P. 7.1.20; 1.1.42

At this stage *nUM* is applicable by two rules, P. 7.1.70, because *gomat*, a *matUP* derivation, is *ugit*, and by P. 7.1.72, because the stem ends in a *jhaL* sound. Apparently, the *Vārttikakāra* does not want the application of *nUM* twice, resulting in the form **gomannt + i*. Therefere he prohibits the application of P. 7.1.70. The derivation then continues :

(3) *goma-nUM-t + i* P. 7.1.72
gomanti.

Śreyas is an *īyasUN* derivation by P. 5.3.57, and therefore *ugit*. The assumed stem is *praśasya*. Here *praśasya* is replaced by *śra*, by P. 5.3.60. *Ṭilopa* by P. 6.4.155 is not applied because of *prakṛtibhāva* by P. 6.4.163. *Bhūyas* is also an *īyasUN* derivation by P. 5.3.57, and therefore *ugit*. The assumed stem is *bahu*, which is replaced by *bhū*, by P. 6.4.158. By the same rule the *ī* of *īyasUN* is deleted.

Patañjali raises the question whether the *nUM* by P. 7.1.72 (*jhallakṣaṇa* sc. *num*) will set aside the *nUM* by P. 7.1.70 (*ugillakṣaṇa* sc. *num*). The difficulty is that *nUM* is applicable by both rules. If we could argue that one of the two rules is the *apavāda* of the other, the difficulty would be solved, because the *apavāda* rule will prevail, and *Vt.* I could be dismissed. But how to argue that? Unfortunately, we cannot establish a *bādhyabādhakabhāva* 'relation in which one rule sets aside the other' between P. 7.1.70 and 72. Patañjali concludes that, since both rules can be applied, they should be applied. The result is a sequence of two *nUMs*, as stated

above. Does that matter? No, it does not. The reason is that we don't hear any difference between the form having one *nUM* and the the form having two *nUMs*. Therefore, to Patañjali's opinion, *Vt.* I is not required. Patañjali returns to his argument in his *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* III.

For Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's views on the relation between general rules and special rules see *ANA*, Note (10). According to Kātyāyana, the *utsarga-apavāda* relation holds good, if the general rule and the special rule cannot be applied together. This implies a conflict in which the special rule sets aside the general rule. But, according to Patañjali, even if the general and the special rule can be applied together, the special rule prevails. Here the question of conflict does not arise. The example is the *takrakauṇḍiṇyanyāya*, referred to in Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* III. But in the present case, we cannot establish which is the general rule and which is the *apavāda*. Therefore, as stated above, both are applied.

Vt. II says that we can manage in accordance with conflict (*vipratiṣedha*) procedure. Reference is to the procedure laid down by P. 1.4.2. See under 5, above. Since P. 7.1.72 is the later rule than P. 7.1.70, it should be applied for inserting *nUM* in the case of neuter stems which are both *ugit* and *jhalanta*.

We have rejected the *para*-principle as a conflict-solving procedure. See *AP* IV, p. 15-30. Then how to decide which out of the two rules concerned is to be applied in the present case? We will say that the rule which is conditioned by an *aupadeśika* element prevails. See *AP* IX, p. 231. In our case, that rule is P. 7.1.70, which is conditioned by *ugit*. *UK* is the *aupadeśika* element. P. 7.1.72 is not conditioned by any such element.

Vt. III is an *iti ced vārttika*. It says that, if it is argued that (*nUM*) becomes applicable again, by P. 7.1.72), (the answer is that the present case is) similar to (that of) the *am* (-substitution taught by P. 7.1.28,) etc.

Reference is first to the maxim stated in *PN*, *pbh.* 39. This *pbh.* allows occasionally the re-application of an earlier rule in the A. after it has been superseded by a later rule. However, *pbh.* 40 says that a rule which has been superseded by another rule cannot be applied again after the other rule has been applied. Reference is also to *Vt.* II on P. 7.1.26. This *Vt.* says that in the case of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* the substitution of the case ending *am* (by P. 7.1.28) prevails over the neuter substitutions, according to conflict procedure. See P. 7.1.26, under 7. The point made is that the *am*-substitution by P. 7.1.28 prevails over the substitutions taught

by P. 7.1.19 and 20, because it is the later (*para*) rule. After the application of *am* by P. 7.1.28 the *Śi*-substitution by P. 7.1.20 is not allowed again, by *PN*, *pbh*. 40.

Vt. IV is one of the rare *Vārttikas* which quotes an example. It says that in the case of *bahūrji* 'having much vigour,' neuter pl. nom. / acc., a prohibition (of *nUM*) is to be phrased. Patañjali supplies the word *brāhmaṇakulāni* 'brahmin families.'

The word *bahūrji* is derived as follows :

(1)	*ūrj* + *KviP*	P. 3.2.177
(2)	*ūrj* + °	P. 6.1.67
	ūrj.	

Then a *bv*. cp. is formed:

(1)	(((*bahu* + *Jas*) + (*ūrj* + *Jas*))^{ap})))	+ *Jas*	P. 2.2.24; 2.1.4
(2)	(((*bahu* + °) + (*ūrj* + °)))))	+ *Jas*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	*bahūrj*	+ *Jas*	P. 6.1.101
(4)	*bahūrj*	+ *'Śi*	P. 7.1.20
	bahūrji.		

In stage (4) *nUM* is applicable by P. 7.1.72. It is prohibited by *Vt*. IV.

Vt. V says that, according to some teachers, *nUM* is inserted (in *bahūrji*) before the final phoneme. By P. 1.1.47 *nUM* is added after the last vowel of a given linguistic item. That would give us the form **bahūnrji*, which is not desired. By *Vt*. V we derive the form *bahūrnji*. Here we can apply P. 8.3.24 and 58. The result is *bahūrñji*, which, apparently, is acceptable to some grammarians.

Patañjali rejects *Vt*. IV.

7.1.73 IKO 'CI VIBHAKTAU '(*nUM* becomes part) of a neuter nominal *aṅga* ending in (a vowel included in) *IK*, if a case ending follows immediately which be-gins with a vowel'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for neuter nouns ending in an *IK*-vowel, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*napuṃsakasya*) *ikaḥ* (*aṅgasya*) *aci vibhaktau*. Here *napuṃsakasya* is continued from P.7.1.72. *Ikaḥ* is interpreted as *igantasya* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *IK* is the *pratyāhāra* of the vowels *i, u. r* and *l*. The long varieties are included by P. 1.1.69. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. It is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. *Aci* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. It is interpreted as *aj-ādau* 'if (a case ending) beginning with a vowel follows immediately' by the *tadādividhi* (*Vt*. XXII on P. 1.1.72). *AC* is the *pratyāhāra* of all vowels. *Vibhaktau* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. *Vibhakti* is the term introduced by P. 1.4.104 for a case ending or a finite verb ending. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*), continued from P. 7.1.58.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are the neuter du. nom. / acc. forms *trapuṇī* 'the two tin objects,' *jatunī* 'the two objects covered with lac,' *tumburuṇī* 'the two coriander seeds' and the neuter sg. dat. forms *trapuṇe* 'for tin,' *jatune* 'for an object covered with lac' and *tumburuṇe* 'for a coriander seed.' No lengthening of the prefinal vowel in the du. forms by P. 6.4.8, because the ntr. dual endings are not *sarvanāmasthāna*. The dual ending *Ī* replaces *au* by P. 7.1.19.

4. To point out the significance of the word *ikaḥ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *kuṇḍe* 'the two pitchers / pits' and *pīṭhe* 'the two seats.'

5. An argument follows which is based on the *Ślokavārttikas* quoted in the *bhāsya* on the present rule, and mentioned by the *KV*. Why has *aci* been stated in the rule? The *KV* first says that this is for the sake of a following rule (P. 7.1.75). But in that case *aci* should have been stated there only. In P. 7.1.73 the only purpose which can be assigned to *aci* is that it is required for deriving the sg. voc., like (*he*) *trapo* 'o piece of tin.' This is, in fact, the answer stated in the last line of *Ślokavt*. ii. Then the *KV* argues that we don't need *aci* for that purpose, because we can manage by P. 8.2.7. This rule prescribes the deletion of *n* in final position of a *prātipadika* which is also a *pada*. The position assumed is, for instance, *trapu* + *nUM* + *sU* in which *nUM* is deleted by P. 8.2.7, and the neuter vocative ending *sU* by P. 7.1.23. That gives us *trapu*. To reach this position, we don't need *aci*.

It is pointed out that the argument fails because we also have P. 8.2.8. This rule prohibits deletion of the *n* in final position of a *prātipadika* specifically before the sg. voc. ending *sU*. Consequently, we would derive forms like **he trapun*, which are not desired. The purpose of *aci* being put in P. 7.1.73 is precisely to prevent the application of P. 8.2.8. Therefore, *nUM* is not added and subsequently deleted by P. 8.2.7. That gives us *trapu* again. But to reach this position, we need *aci*.

An objection is raised. We have P. 1.1.63, which says that after the deletion of a suffix an operation conditioned by the suffix on the *aṅga* is not allowed. Once the neuter vocative ending *sU* is deleted (by P. 7.1.23), we cannot apply *nUM* any more. Too bad. But then the *KV*, following Patañjali (*Mbh.* III, p. 267, lines 6-7), points out that the very mention of *aci* is meant to give us a clue, namely, that P. 1.1.63, which prohibits a rule from taking effect, does not apply in the present case of the sg. voc. And that is how we can proceed from the position *trapu* to (*he*) *trapo* by applying *guṇa* by P. 7.3.108.

6. To point out the significance of the word *vibhaktau* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexample *taumburavaṃ cūrṇam* 'powder produced of coriander.' Here the word *tumburu* is not followed by a *vibhakti*, but by a *taddhita* suffix. Reference is to P. 4.3.139. *Guṇa* of the final *u* is by P. 6.4.148. That gives us *tumburo*. Then P. 6.1.78 is applied before the suffix *aÑ*. The suffix is added in the sense of *vikāra* 'product,' as explained by the *Nyāsa*.

7. The *KV* finally quotes two *ślokavārttikas*, discussed in the *bhāṣya* on the present rule. See below, under 8.

8. We have three *Vts* on the rule, and two *Ślokavārttikas*. The *bhāṣya* does not start with a discussion of the *Vts*, but straightaway starts discussing the first *ślokavt*. For the reason see under 9, below. The *ślokavt*. is divided into five parts.

The first part reads *iko 'ci vyañjane mā bhūt* '(P. 7.1.73 says *iko 'ci*) so that (the rule does not apply, if a (a case ending beginning with) a consonant immediately follows (after the *aṅga*).' Patañjali introduces this part by raising the question why *aci* has been mentioned in the rule. He quotes the examples *trapubhyām* 'with the two tin objects' and *trapubhiḥ* 'with the tin objects.' Here the stem ends in an *iK*-vowel. Therefore P. 7.3.73 is applicable. The result of the application would be the forms **trapunbhyām* and **trapunbhis*, which are not desired.

The second part reads *astu lopaḥ* 'let there be deletion (of *nUM*).' Patañjali explains that reference is to P. 8.2.7. See under 5, above. Even if *nUM* is added in the examples just quoted, we can delete it by P. 8.2.7. Therefore no need for *aci*.

The third part reads *svaraḥ katham* '(then) what about accent?' Patañjali quotes the examples *pañcatrapubhyām* 'with the two bundles of five tin objects' and *pañcatrapubhyaḥ* 'from the bundles of five tin objects,' the dual and pl. instr. of a *samāhāradvigu* cp. by P. 2.1.51-52. Here the constituent *pañca* retains its original

accent (*ādyudātta*, *Phitsūtra* 28). According to P 6.2.29, a *dvigu* cp. retains the original accent of the *pūrvapada*, if the second member ends in an *iK*-vowel. Thus the accented forms are *páñcatrapubhyām* and *páñcatrapubhis*. The case endings are unaccented by P. 3.1.4.

Now, if *nUM* is inserted in the examples by P. 7.1.73 without *aci*, the final cop. member will not end in an *iK*-vowel any more. In fact, it will be *numanta*, Consequently, in *trapubhis* the original accent of the first member cannot be retained by P. 6.2.29, and the cp. will be *antodātta* by P. 6.1.223. This is not desired. To prevent it, the mention of *aci* in P. 7.1.73 is required.

The fourth part reads *svaro vai śrūyamāṇe 'pi* 'certainly the accent (will remain as it is) even if (*nUM*) is heard.' Patañjali quotes the sg. instr. and abl./gen. forms *pañcatrapuṇā* and *pañcatrapuṇaḥ*. Here *nUM* is added by P. 7.1.73. It is not deleted by P. 8.2.7, because the *aṅga* is not a *pada* (by P. 1.4.17) as required, but it is called *bha* by P. 1.4.18, considering that the following case ending begins with a vowel. Still, P. 6.2.29 applies, because, although the *aṅga pañcatrapun* ends in *nUM*, the second cp. member *trapu* ends in an *iK*-vowel. In other words, the insertion of *nUM* does not destroy the fact that the *uttarapada* ends in an *iK*-vowel. It only destroys the *igantatva* of the *aṅga*. The condition for applying P. 6.2.29 is that the second cp. member must end in an *iK*-vowel. This condition is met. Therefore the original accent of the first cp. member is retained. Consequently, there is no need for *aci* in P. 7.1.73.

The fifth part reads *lupte kiṃ na bhaviṣyati* 'why will (the accent) not be there, if *nUM* is deleted?' In other words, what does it matter whether *nUM* is there or not? As stated, the condition for applying the accent rule P. 6.2.29 is that the second cp. member must end in an *iK* vowel. The addition of *nUM* in *pañcatrapu-ṇ-ā* does not change the fact that *trapu* ends in an *iK*-vowel. Therefore, what difference does the presence or absence of *nUM* make? The second cp. member *trapu* is *iganta* in any case. The conclusion is that the reference to accent is futile. For the deletion of *nUM* we can still manage by P. 8.2.7, and there is not need for *aci* in P. 7.1.73.

The *bhāṣya* on this fifth part of *Ślokavārttika* i is presented in a confusing way in the Kielhorn edition. The first lines do deal with the last part of *Ślokavārttika* i. But then, rather abruptly, without indication, the discussion shifts to the first line of *Ślokavārttika* ii, for which Patañjali presents the examples, by saying *idaṃ tarhi*. It looks as if part of the text is lost here.

The first line of *Ślokavārttika* ii says that the substitution of *ā* for *ai* of *rai* 'wealth' by P. 7.2.85, and that of *tisṛ* for *tri* 'three' by P. 7.2.99 can go ahead even if *nUM* intervenes. No reason is stated. The second line deals with the *Vts* I-III on P. 7.1.73 and with *trapo* as the justification of the mention of the word *aci* in the rule, and will be discussed in the *bhāṣya* on these *Vts.*

By way of examples for the *ā*-substitution Patañjali quotes the forms *atirābhyām* 'with the two extremely wealthy (families)' and *atirābhiḥ* 'with the extremely wealthy (families).' The word *kula* 'family' is supplied to account for the neuter gender. The stem *is rai.* See Whitney, § 361 b. The cp. is derived by *Saunāgavārttika* A[1] on P. 2.2.18. See *TA*, p. 190. The vowel is shortened in the neuter gender to *i* by P. 1.2.47 At the stage in which *bhyām / bhis* is added, two rules become applicable, P. 7.1.73 for *nUM*, and P. 7.2.85 for the substitution of *ā* for the final stem vowel. Suppose *nUM* is inserted by P. 7.1.73 (without *aci*). That gives us [*atiri* + *num*] + *bhyām / bhis.* Now the difficulty is that we cannot apply P. 7.2.85, because *num* intervenes. To solve the difficulty, Patañjali invokes the *para*-principle. Reference is to P. 1.4.2, which, according to tradition, applies throughout the A. Accordingly, P. 7.2.85 prevails over P. 7.1.73. That gives us the desired forms *atirābhyām / atirābhis.* Here P. 7.1.73 cannot be applied any more, because the *aṅga* does not end in an *iK*-vowel. The conclusion is that the word *aci* in P. 7.1.73 is not required.

By way of examples for the *tisṛ*-substitution Patañjali quotes the forms *priyatisṛbhyām* 'with the two persons to whom three females are dear' and *priyatisṛbhiḥ* 'with the persons to whom three females are dear.' For the translation see the *KV* on P. 7.2.99. The cp. stem is *priyatri*. It is a *bv.* cp. by P. 2.2.24. At the stage in which *bhyām / bhis* is added, two rules become applicable, P. 7.1.73 for *nUM*, and P. 7.2.99 for the substitution of *tisṛ* for *tri*. Patañjali again invokes the *para*-principle. Accordingly, P. 7.2.99 prevails. However - and this is the difference with the previous examples -, after the application of P. 7.2.99 the earlier rule P. 7.1.73 remains applicable. Therefore the question is of *punahprasaṅga* 're-applicability' of P. 7.1.73 by *PN*, *pbh.* 39. Since this would lead to the undesired forms **priyatisṛnbhyām* and **priyatisṛnbhis*, *punaḥprasaṅga* is denied by invoking *pbh.* 40. The conclusion remains the same : there is not need for *aci* in P. 7.1.73.

As shown, Patañjali justifies the examples by invoking *paratva* 'the fact of (P. 7.2.85 and 99) being the later rules (in comparison with P. 7.1.73).' We note that in doing so he glosses over the words *vyavadhānān numā api* 'in spite of intervention by *nUM*' in the *Ślokavt*. What does the *Ślokavārttikakāra* mean? We take again Patañjali's examples.

(1) *atiri*	+ *bhyām*	P. 1.2.47; 1.4.2
(2) [*atiri-nUM*]	+ *bhyām*	P. 7.1.73 (without *aci*); 1.1.47

By *PN, pbh.* 37, that which has undergone a change in part is treated as non-different (from the original). Thus, even after the substitution of *i* for *ai*, we can still treat *ri* as the original *rai*. By *PN, pbh.* 29, a word used to denote a linguistic element in the *aṅgādhikāra* stands also for a form ending in that element. This enables us to apply P. 7.2.85 to *atiri*. The rule tells us that *ā* is substituted for the *aṅga* final *ai* of *rai*, if a suffix beginning with a consonant follows immediately. In stage (2) this condition is obviously not met. But the *Ślokavārttikakāra* tells us to go ahead nevertheless.

(3) *atirā-n*	+ *bhyām*	P. 7.2.65; *Ślokavt.* ii on P. 7.1.73
(4) *atirā* °	+ *bhyām*	P. 8.2.7
atirābhyām.		

How can the *Ślokavārttikakāra* tell us to go ahead with the *ā*-substitution in stage (3)? It is worth while to quote the *Nyāsa* on this point (*KV*, Benares ed., Vol. V, p. 615). *Kasmāt punar vyavadhāne tau bhavataḥ. 'Rāyo hali ity atra rāyo yā vihitā vibhaktiḥ triśabdāc ca yā vihitā vibhaktis tasyām iti vihitaviśeṣaṇapakṣasya tatrāśrayaṇāt* 'But how can these two (the *ā*-substitution and the substitution of *tisṛ*) take place when there is intervention? By adopting the *vihitaviśeṣaṇa*-view regarding the case ending prescribed after *rai* by P. 7.2.85 and the case ending prescribed after *tri* (by P. 7.2.99).'

Let us confine ourselves to P. 7.2.85. This rule contains the abl. *rāyaḥ* and the loc. condition *hali*. If *rāyaḥ* is taken in the technical sense of the abl. by P. 1.1.67, the immediate sequence of *rai* and the case ending which begins with a consonant is required for the operation prescribed by P. 7.2.85, namely, the *ā*-substitution. No immediate sequence, no substitution. That lands us in difficulties with the application of P. 7.1.73, because by this rule *nUM* will intervene between the stem *rai* and the case ending. To avoid this difficulty, another interpretation of *rāyo hali* is proposed. We can interpret it as an instance of *vihitaviśeṣaṇa*. For what is meant by this term see under Excursus, below. In any case, the assumption of *vihitaviśeṣaṇa* does away with the requirement of immediate sequence. Thereby the intervention of another element, like *nUM*, between the *aṅga* and the *vibhakti* is allowed.

The same *prakriyā* pattern is applied in the example *priyatisrbhyām*, as follows :

(1)	*priyatri*	+ *bhyām*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	[*priyatri-nUM*]	+ *bhyām*	P. 7.1.73 (without *aci*)
(3)	*priyatisṛn*	+ *bhyām*	P. 7.2.99; *Ślokavt.* ii on P. 7.1.73
(4)	*priyatisr°*	+ *bhyām*	P. 8.2.7
	priyatisṛbhyām.		

Thus, whereas Patañjali goes by *paratva* (P. 1.4.2), the *Ślokavārttikakāra*, assuming that *rāyaḥ hali* in P. 7.2.85 and *tricaturābhyāṃ vibhaktau* 'given a case ending which comes after *tri* or *catur*' to be supplied in P. 7.2.99 are *vihitapañcamī* constructions. The conclusion so far is that *aci* in P. 7.3.73 is not required.

EXCURSUS on *vihitaviśeṣaṇa*

According to the Pathak-Chitrao Word Index on the *Mahābhāṣya*, the term *vihitaviśeṣaṇa* is used by Patañjali in his *bhāṣya* on eleven *sūtras*. The formula used is *vihitaviśeṣaṇaṃ tadgrahaṇaṃ. Tasmād yo vihita iti* 'the mention of x is the *viśeṣaṇa* of (what is called) *vihita* 'prescribed / added.' That is, (the item) which has been prescribed after / added to x. See, for instance, *Mbh.* II, p. 73, line 14, where Patañjali uses the expression *vihitaviśeṣaṇaṃ dhātugrahaṇaṃ*. Here the abl. word *dhātoḥ* (P. 3.1.91) is taken as the qualifier / specifier of *vihita*. In lines 15-16 Patañjali explains it as *dhātunā* (...) *vihitaṃ viśeṣayiṣmāhaḥ* (...) 'we will qualify *vihita* by *dhātu*.' What does that mean?

The use of the term *vihitaviśeṣaṇa* requires a particular context. Here a word in the abl. figures which is followed by a word in the loc. or gen., which states the item which is *vihita*. The meaning of the abl. in its technical sense is defined by P. 1.1.67 with the help of the term *uttara* which is interpreted to mean 'following immediately after.' For example, *aṅgād aci* 'given (a suffix beginning with a vowel) which comes immediately after an *aṅga*,' (P. 7.1.73), or *dhātor lasya* 'in place of *l* which comes immediately after a verbal base' (P. 3.4.77).

Vihitaviśeṣaṇa is a *tp.* cp. It means 'the qualifier / specifier of *vihita*.' Following the *Nyāsa* quoted earlier, we render *vihita* as the linguistic item prescribed. In the expression *vihitaviśeṣaṇam dhātugrahaṇam* the mention of the word *dhātu* (i.e., *dhātoḥ* in P. 3.1.91) functions as the qualifier of the linguistic item which is (called) *vihita* 'prescribed.' This agrees with Patañjali's phrase *dhātunā vihitaṃ viśeṣayiṣyāmaḥ*, according to which *dhātu* qualifies or specifies the *vihita* item.

In P. 7.2.85 we have the abl. word *rāyaḥ* and the loc. word *hali*. Here *hali* refers to a *vibhakti* which is the *vihita* item. Then, by adopting the *vihitaviśeṣaṇa*-

view, we will say that *rāyaḥ* qualifies / specifies the *vibhakti*. Not any *vibhakti*, but a *vibhakti* which comes after *rai*.

Why not immediately after *rai*? The point of adopting the *vihitaviśeṣaṇa*-view is precisely to get rid of immediate sequence. The reason is that *vihita* merely means 'prescribed.' It does not mean *uttara* in the sense used in P. 1.1.67. We may, therefore, call the abl. assumed in the *vihitaviśeṣaṇapakṣa* a *vihitapañcamī*, that is, an abl. ending denoting the sense of *vihita*, in distinction from the abl. ending technically defined with the help of the word *uttara*. The term *vihitapañcamī* is used by Nāgeśa, *PN*, Part I (on *pbh*. 41), p.71, line 3, *tatra dhātoḥ iti vihitapañcamī* 'there the word *dhātoḥ* is a *vihitapañcamī*.'

End of excursus

9. Then Patañjali's discussion shifts to the *Vārttikas*. They contain the answer to and the refutation of contention of the first *Ślokavārttika* and the first line of the second *Ślokavārttika*, namely, that *aci* in P. 7.1.71 is not required. The answer is briefly summed up by the second line of the second *Ślokavārttika*. It says that *nUṬ* has to be stated (as prevailing over *nUM* by *pūrvavipratiṣedha*); that *aci* is needed for a following rule (P. 7.1.75) and that some purpose for the mention of *aci* in P. 7.1.73 is found in the vocative form (*he*) *trapo*.

Vt. I says that the mention of *aci* in P. 7.1.73 serves to maintain a conflict between *nUM* and *nUṬ*. Patañjali quotes the examples *trapūṇām* 'of the tin objects' and *jatūnām* 'of the objects covered with lac.'

According to *Vt*. XI on P. 7.1.96, the augment *nUṬ* (prescribed by P. 7.1.54) prevails over *nUM* (P. 7.1.73), *aci ra* (the *r*-substitution for the vowel *ṛ* in the case of *tisṛ* and *catasṛ* before a vowel, P. 7.2.100) and *tṛjvadbhāva* 'treatment like a word ending in *tṛC* (P. 7.1.95). As explained by Patañjali, *nUṬ* prevails by *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'a conflict in which the earlier rule prevails.' See *AP* IV, p. 20-27.

Here we are concerned with the prevalence of *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.54) over *nUM* (P. 7.1.73). *NUT* is added as the initial phoneme to a given element, by P. 1.1.46. *Vipratiṣedha* here means that the two rules concerned block each other. Thus, if *nUṬ* is applied first by P. 7.1.54, there is no chance for *nUM* by P. 7.1.73, and vice versa. This is a two-way conflict.

Take the example *trapūṇām*. At the stage *trapu* + *ām* both P. 7.1.54 and 73 are applicable. P. 7.1.54 requires an *aṅga* which ends in short vowel. P. 7.1.73

requires a neuter *aṅga* which ends in an *iK*-vowel plus a *vibhakti* which begins with a vowel. All requirements are met. But if we apply P. 7.1.73 first, we cannot apply P. 7.1.54 any more because now the *aṅga* ends in *nUM*. If we first apply P. 7.1.54, we cannot apply P. 7.1.73, because now the *vibhakti* begins with *nUṬ* and is not *aj-ādi* any more. So this is a clear case of conflict. Tradition solves it by assuming *pūrvavipratiṣedha*.

The point of *Vt*. I is that this *vipratiṣedha*, which is desired, is only possible, if *aci* is stated in P. 7.1.73. If *aci* were not there, the only condition stated in this rule would be *vibhaktau*. That is to say, *nUM* sould be inserted before any case ending, whether beginning with a consonant, or with a vowel. Or, in still other words, *nUM* would be *nitya* 'invariably applicable,' never mind whether another element is applied or not, or *siddha* 'having taken effect.' On the other hand, once *aci* is stated in P. 7.1.73, after the application of *nUṬ* we cannot apply *nUM*. That is to say, *nUM is anitya* 'not invariably applicable,' just like *nUṬ*. This being so, *Vt*. I tells us that *nUṬ* prevails over *nUM*, namely, by *pūrvavipratiṣedha*.

Since we have rejected *pūrvatva* and *paratva* as conflict-solving principles, the question is how to justify the application of the *nUṬ*-rule in the present case. Our answer is that in a two-way conflict we have recourse to the *utsarga-apavāda* principle. See *AP* IV, p. 35-36, and *AP* IX, p. 87. Between P. 7.1.54 and P. 7.1.73 an *utsarga-apavāda* relation can be established in the sense that the *nUṬ*-rule, P. 7.1.54, is the special rule, because it specifically applies to the pl. gen. case ending *ām*, whereas the *nUM*-rule applies before any case suffix beginning with a vowel. Therefore the *nUṬ*-rule prevails.

Vt. II states the reason for *Vt*. I. It says that, otherwise, if *aci* is not mentioned in P. 7.1.73, there would be no room for *nUṬ*, because *nUM* is invariably applicable.

Vt. III says that *aci* has also been mentioned for the sake of a following rule. The following rule in question is P. 7.1.75. It says that *anAṄ* is substituted for (the *aṅga* final of) *asthi* 'bone,' etc., if a case ending beginning with a vowel (*aci*) follows immediately, from the instr. case ending onwards. The word *tṛtīyādi* is continued from P. 7.1.74. Thus we derive as follows :

(1) *asthi* + *Ṭā*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *asthan* + *ā*	P. 7.1.75; 1.1.52
(3) *asth°n* + *ā*	P. 6.4.134
asthnā.	

Now, suppose *aci* is not continued, because it is not there in P. 7.1.73. In that case, P. 7.1.75 applies before any case ending. As follows:

(1) *asthi* + *bhyām* P. 4.1.2
(2) *asthan* + *bhyām* P. 7.1.75; 1.1.52
(3) *astha°* + *bhyām* P. 8.2.7
**asthabhyām.*

This form is not desired. The desired form is *asthibhyām*. See Whitney, § 431. To prevent the undesired form, we need the word *aci* in P. 7.1.75. But if that is so, then there must be some purpose in mentioning it in P. 7.1.73 also. Which is that purpose? As stated in then last line of *Ślokavt.* ii, it is found in the ntr. sg. voc. The sg. voc. ending begins with a consonant. The example is (*he*) *trapo* 'o piece of tin.' The derivation is as follows:

(1) *trapu* + *sU* P. 2.3.49; P. 4.1.2
(2) *trapu* + ° P. 7.1.23

Here the operational effects of *sU* remain in force by P. 1.1.62. We can therefore apply *nUM*.

(3) *trapu* + *nUM* P. 7.1.73

In this stage *lopa* of *n* by P. 8.2.7 is prohibited by P. 8.2.8. Consequently, we derive the form

**trapun*. This form is not desired. To prevent it, *aci* in P. 7.1.73 is required.

An objection is raised. We cannot invoke P. 1.1.61, because the suffix *sU* is *luk*-deleted by P. 7.1.23. Once a suffix is *luk*-deleted, no operational effects remain in force, by P. 1.1.63. If that is the case, we cannot add *nUM* at all by P. 7.1.73. Therefore *aci* in P. 7.1.73 is not required. We can manage without it. Anyway, *aci* has been stated. That can only be purposeful, if it is assumed that the mention of *aci* here is meant to give us a clue. The clue is that in the present case we go by some other method, namely, *pratyayalakṣaṇa*, even though it is prohibited by P. 1.1.63. That is shown in stage (4) (*he*) *trapo*, in which *guṇa* is applied by P. 7.3.108. Although the voc. ending is *luk*-deleted, the prohibition of P. 1.1.62 by P. 1.1.63 is not applied, because, apparently, the latter rule is *anitya* 'not universally valid.'

10. P. 7.1.73 closes the section dealing with the augment *nUM*.

7.1.74 TṚTĪYĀDIṢU BHĀṢITAPUṂSKAṂ PUṂVAD GĀLAVASYA 'according to Gālava, (a ntr. *aṅga* ending in an *iK*-vowel), which has a corresponding masc. form in the same meaning, is treated like the masc., if (case endings which begin with a vowel) starting from the instr. endings follow immediately'

1. This is a *atideśasūtra* ascribed to a pre-pāṇinian grammarian. It prescribes treatment of a ntr. adjective like the corresponding masc. adjective on the conditions stated. What is meant by 'meaning' will be clear from the discussion. For *atideśasūtra* see *ATA*, p. 3, n. 1.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*igantaṃ napuṃsakam*) *bhāṣitapuṃskam* (*aṅgam ajādiṣu*) *tṛtīyādiṣu* (*vibhaktiṣu*). Here the word *igantam* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.73. *Napuṃsakam* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.72.

Bhāṣitapuṃska is a technical term known from P. 6.3.34. It is a *bv.* cp. According to the *Nyāsa* (*KV*, Benares ed., Vol. V, p. 619), the *anyapadārtha* is *śabda* 'a word,' but some more qualifications need to be added. See under 7 below. The suffix *kaP* has been added to the stem *bhāṣitapuṃs* by P. 5.4.154.In P. 6.3.34 reference is to fem. adjectives for which a corresponding masc. form is available, according to the gender of the word qualified. In the present rule reference is to ntr. adjectives for which a corresponding masc. form is available, according to the gender of the word qualified. There is another difference also between these two rules. In P. 6.3.34-42 *bhāṣitapuṃska* refers to adjectives used in cp.- and *taddhita* formations. In the present rule, however, *bhāṣitapuṃska* refers to independent adjectival words, not forming part of a cp. or *taddhita* formation.

Aṅgam is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.1.4. *Ajādiṣu* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.73. *Tṛtīyā* is the name given to a particular set of case endings corresponding to the enumeration given by P. 4.1.2. *Tṛtīyādiṣu* qualifies *vibhaktiṣu* which continues *vibhaktau* from P. 7.1.73 (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*). Since the present rule is applicable from the instr. endings which begin with a vowel onwards, it is not applicable before the nom. and acc. endings. The *vidheya* is *puṃvad gālavasya*. It discontinues *nUM* from P. 7.1.73. For the stem *pum* see Whitney, § 394 b. °*Vat* is the *taddhita* suffix added by P. 5.1.116 in the sense of *iva*.

Gālava is mentioned in three more *sūtras* in the A. Traditionally, a grammatical operation prescribed by a rule which mentions the name of a teacher is

considered to be optional. Therefore, regarding the present rule, what is the option? The option is between *puṃvadbhāva* and non-*puṃvadbhāva*, that is, between applying *nUM* prescribed for *iganta* ntr. stems by P. 7.1.73, or not applying *nUM*. The question of shortening of the final stem vowel in the case of ntr. stems by P. 1.2.47 is left out of acccount for the time being. The option is only available for *bhāṣitapuṃska* words.

3. *Puṃvat* literally means 'treated like a masculine.' In grammar it amounts to a transference or extension of gender-based operations on specified conditions. Operations applicable to masc. gender adjectival stems are transferred to non-masc. gender adjectival stems.

Therefore *puṃvat* should not be taken to imply *puṃsi vihitānāṃ kāryāṇām atideśaḥ* 'transference of grammatical operations prescribed for masc. words,' but *napuṃsake vihitānāṃ kāryānām atideśo na* 'no transference of grammatical opera-tions prescribed for ntr. words.' This prohibits operations applicable to ntr. stems only, like the one prescribed by P. 7.1.73. This rule prescribes *nUM* for neuter stems in connection with *aj-ādi* case endings. That is why the *Nyāsa* characterizes the present rule as a *pratiṣedhātideśasūtra* 'a rule which transfers a prohibition.'

4. The *KV* explains that in the case of *bhāṣitapuṃska words* used along with ntr. substantives there is no shortening (P. 1.2.47), nor the insertion of *nUM* (P. 7.1.72) before the instr. case endings, etc. which begin with a vowel. The *Nyāsa* explains that before these case endings there is no grammatical operation prescribed for the masc. which can be transferred to the neuter. Therefore, *puṃvat* does not mean transference of operation (*kāryātideśa*), but transference of the prohibition of grammatical operations which are restricted to ntr. forms only.

5. In the case of masc. stems ending in short *i* or *u* the following operations, mentioned by *Vt*. I on the rule, are applicable, although in the rules concerned the word *puṃsi* 'in the masc. gender' is not used :

(1) P. 7.1.54. It prescribes the insertion of *nUṬ* for stems ending in a short vowel before the pl. gen. ending *ām*.

(2) P 7.3.111. It prescribes *guṇa* of the *aṅga* final before case endings marked with Ṅ. In the present context these case endings are the sg. dat., abl. and gen. endings.

(3) P. 7.3.119. It prescribes the substitution of *auṬ* for the sg. loc. ending *Ṅi*.

(4) P. 7.3.120. It prescribes the substitution of *nā* for the sg. instr. ending *āṄ*, except in the case of fem. stems. *ĀṄ* is the pre-pāṇinian term for what is called *Ṭā* by P. 4.1.2.

6. When *puṃvadbhāva* is not applied, *nUM* is applied by P. 7.1.73, and shortening of the final stem vowel in the ntr. by P. 1.2.47. Accordingly, the examples quoted by the *KV* are divided into two groups, *puṃvadbhāva* and non-*puṃvadbhāva* showing an inserted *n*, as follows :

A. For a stem ending in long *Ī*. In these stems before the instr. endings, etc. shortening by P. 1.2.47 is not applied, when *puṃvadbhāva* is applied, but *yAṆ-ādeśa* is applied to the final vowel *Ī* by P. 6.4.82. The substitution holds good also for adjectival forms derived from a verbal base.

The *KV* first quotes the sg. nom. forms of the examples used. They are *grāmaṇīḥ brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a brahmin who is headman of a village,' and *grāmaṇi brāhmaṇakulam* 'a brahmin family who is head of a village.' Since these are nom. forms, P. 7.1.74 does not apply. Shortening of the final vowel in the ntr. form *grāmaṇi* is by P. 1.2.47. For the derivation of *grāmaṇī* see *AP* IX, p. 241.

(1) For the sg. instr.

grāmaṇyā / grāmaṇinā brāhmaṇakulena 'by a brahmin family who is the head of a village'

(2) For the sg. dat.

grāmaṇye / grāmaṇine brāhmaṇakulāya 'to a brahmin family who is the head of a village.' In *grāmaṇye* the *guṇa*-rule P. 7.3.111 is not applied.

(3) For the sg. abl.

grāmaṇyo / grāmaṇino brāhmaṇakulāt 'from a brahmin family who is the head of a village'

(4) For the sg. gen.

grāmaṇyo / grāmaṇino brāhmaṇakulasya 'of a brahmin family who is the head of a village'

(5) For the du.gen. / loc.

grāmaṇyor / grāmaṇinor brāhmaṇakulayoḥ 'of / with regard to the two brahmin families who are the head of a village'

(6) For the pl. gen.

grāmaṇyām / grāmaṇīnāṃ brāhmaṇakulānām 'of the brahmin families who are head of a village' Here the *KV* refers to *Vt.* XI on P. 7.1.96, which says that *nUṬ* prevails over *nUM* by *pūrvavipratiṣedha*. See P. 7.1.73, under 9.

(7) For the sg. loc.

grāmaṇyām / grāmaṇini brāhmaṇakule 'with regard to a brahmin familiy who is the head of a village'

B. For a stem ending in short *i*

Again, the *KV* first quotes the sg. nom. forms of the examples. They are *śucir brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a pure brahmin' and *śuci brāhmaṇakulam* 'a pure brahmin family.' Since these are nom. forms, P. 7.1.74 does not apply. The question of shortening by P. 1.2.47 does not arise. Compare Whitney, § 344, who says that in those weak cases in which ntr. nouns differ from masculines in the later language by an inserted *n*, the ntr. adjective is allowed to take either form.

(1) For the sg. instr.

śucinā brāhmaṇakulena 'by a pure brahmin family.' There are no two forms here, because the *nā*-substitution by P. 7.3.120 and the insertion of *nUM* by P. 7.1.73 result in the same form. It makes no difference here whether *puṃvadbhāva* is applied, or not.

(2) For the sg. dat.

śucaye / śucine brāhmaṇakulāya 'to a pure brahmin family'

(3) For the sg. abl.

śucer / śucino brāhmaṇakulāt 'from a pure brahmin family'

(4) For the sg. gen.

śucer / śucino brāhmaṇakulasya 'of a pure brahmin family'

(5) For the du. gen. / loc.

śucyor / śucinor brāhmaṇakulayoḥ 'of / with regard to the two pure brahmin families'

(6) For the sg. loc.

śucau / śucini brāhmaṇakule 'with regard to a pure brahmin family'

In all the examples for *puṃvadbhāva* the four abovementioned operations are applicable.

6. To point out the significance of the word *tṛtīyādiṣu* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *grāmaṇinī brāhmaṇakule* 'two brahmin families who are the head of a village' and *śucinī brāhmaṇakule* 'two pure brahmin families.' Here the *puṃvadbhāva* forms *grāmaṇyau* and *śucī* are not allowed.

To point out the significance of the word *bhāṣitapuṃska*, the *KV* quotes the sg. dat. counterexamples *trapuṇe* 'for a tin object' and *jatune* 'for an object covered with lac.' These two words are ntr. substantives, not adjectival words. Therefore they are not *bhāṣitapuṃska*.

7. Referring to *Vts* IV and V on the rule, the *KV* then raises the question why the rule does not apply here, in the usage *pīlune phalāya* 'for a *pīlu* fruit,' for which we only have the ntr. noun form, not the masc. form *pīlave* (*guṇa* by P. 7.3.111). The word *pīlu* is known both in the meaning '(a particular) tree' and in that of '(a particular) fruit.' The answer is stated as *samānāyām ākṛtau yad bhāṣitapuṃskaṃ tulye pravṛttinimitte tasya puṃvadbhāvaḥ* 'treatment like a masc. word takes place of that *bhāṣitapuṃska* form which (is used) when there is a common *ākṛti*, (that is,) the same *pravṛttinimitta*.' Compare the *KV* on P. 6.3.34 where the same condition for *puṃvadbhāva* is stated. The *Nyāsa* (*KV*, Benares ed, Vol. V, p. 619) explains that here the word *ākṛti* is used in the sense of the *pravṛttinimitta* of a word. *Pravṛttinimitta* means the reason why a particular word is used with reference to a particular thing. See *BDA*, n. 515. The *Nyāsa* further explains that

ākṛti does not mean *saṃniveśa* 'the application of words to the same thing,' (synonymy), nor merely *jāti* 'a class / genus.' For the difference between *ākṛti* and *jāti* see *PASPA*, p. 83. In the case of *pīlu* there is no common *ākṛti*. For the ntr. word *pīlu* the *pravṛttinimitta* is *phalatva* 'being a fruit.' For the masc. word *pīlu* the *pravṛttinimitta* is *vṛkṣatva* 'being a tree.' Therefore there are really two different words *pīlu*. Consequently, *pīlu* is not a *bhāṣitapuṃska* word, and the question of *puṃvadbhāva* does not arise.

How can we have that from the word *bhāṣitapuṃska*? The same question is raised in the *KV* on P. 6.3.34, and the same answer is repeated in the present case. The answer given by the *KV* is based on Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on *Vt.* III on the present rule, (*Mbh.* III, p. 268, lines 6-7). Its reads *bhāṣitaḥ pumān yasmin arthe pravṛttinimitte sa bhāṣitapuṃskaśabdenocyate* 'that (meaning) is denoted by the word *bhāsitapumska* in which meaning, (that is,) *pravṛttinimitta*, a masc. gender word is (also) used.' Therefore the analysis of the word *bhāṣitapuṃska* is not *bhāṣitaḥ pumān yena śabdena* 'that word by which the masc. gender is used,' but *bhāṣitaḥ pumān yasmin arthe* 'that meaning for which a masc. word is used.'

8. The rule applies to *iganta* stems only. The counterexamples are *kīlālapā brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a brahmin who drinks *kīlāla*' and *kīlālapaṃ brāhmaṇakulam* 'a *kilāla* drinking brahmin family.' Here, of course, P. 7.1.74 does not apply. But it does not apply either in the sg. instr. *kīlālapena brāhmaṇakulena* 'by a *kīlāla* drinking brahmin family' for which only one form is available. The stem *kīlālapā* is also referred to in the *KV* on P. 6.4.140. For the *prakriyā* see *AP* IX, p. 369.

The masc. sg. instr. is *kīlālapā*. Here the *ā* in final position of *pā-* is deleted by P. 6.4.64 before the case ending. In the neuter this *ā* is shortened by P. 1.2.47. Therefore P. 6.4.64 is not applied. The ntr. sg. instr. is *kīlālapena* by P. 7.1.12. Here, if *puṃvadbhāva* is applied, the form will be the same, namely, *kīlālapā*. But *puṃvadbhāva* is restricted to *iganta* stems only. Therefore in the example quoted the question of *puṃvadbhāva* does not arise.

9. The rule applies before a case ending beginning with a vowel only. The counterexample is *grāmaṇibhyāṃ brāhmaṇakulābhyām* 'by the brahmin families who are head of a village.' The (undesired) *puṃvadbhāva* form would have been **grāmaṇībhyām* (no shortening by P. 1.2.47).

10. We have five *Vts* on the rule. In his introductory *bhāṣya* to *Vt.* I Patañjali raises the question, what is really transferred by the present rule? The answer is, the prohibition of the augment *nUM* which has been prescribed for ntr.

stems by P. 7.1.73 before case endings beginning with a vowel. Here Patañjali assumes that the transference meant is of a grammatical operation (*kāryātideśa*). The introductory *bhāṣya* ends with the observation that there is no grammatical operation specified by the word *puṃsi* 'in the masc. gender' which can be transferred before instr. case endings on account of a word being *bhāṣitapuṃska*. As a matter of fact, there is no rule in the A. which prescribes a special operation for masc. stems only, with one exception. That is P. 6.1.103 which prescribes the substitution of *n* for the *s* of the masc. pl. acc. ending *Śas*.

Vt. I is an *iti ced vārttika*. It assumes that by *puṃvat* transference is meant of grammatical operations (*kāryātideśa*). It says that if the word *puṃvat* prohibits *nUM* (by P. 7.1.73) (only), then a prohibition of *guṇa* (P. 7.1.111), of the substitution of *nā* (P. 7.3.130), of *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.54), and of the substitution of *au* (P. 7.3.119) should be stated. See under 5, above.

The *Vt*. does not mention the vowel shortening prescribed by P. 1.2.47 for ntr. stems. It asumes that P. 7.1.74 prohibits *nUM* only, and not the shortening prescribed for neuter stems by P. 1.2.47. Thus shortening is allowed, as shown in *grāmaṇi*. In that case, the four operations summed up will be applicable to *grāmaṇī*. That is why these operations should be prohibited. Patañjali says that the four rules referred to by the *Vt*. assume the shortened form to be the base form. He then quotes the examples for each of the four prohibitions.

What is the problem before the *Vārttikakāra*? *Puṃvat* means 'like the masc. gender.' The problem is that, as Patañjali says, there are no specific grammatical operations prescribed for masc. words before the instr., etc. case endings which begin with a vowel. See under 3. above. Therefore *puṃvadbhāva* can only prohibit operations prescribed for stems before case endings beginning with a vowel, from the instr. endings onwards. Here what is prohibited is the insertion of *nUM* prescribed by P. 7.1.73. That is what *puṃvadbhāva* of ntr. adjectives amounts to. The result is the following paradigm in which the neuter noun *brāhmaṇakula* is to be supplied :

sg. instr.	*grāmaṇi + ā*
sg. dat.	*grāmaṇi + e*
sg. abl. / gen.	*grāmaṇi + as*
pl. gen.	*grāmaṇi + ām*
sg. loc.	*grāmaṇi + e*

Since here *grāmaṇi* ends in short *i* (by P. 1.2.47; the prohibition of shortening only comes with *Vt.* II), *guṇa* by P. 7.1.111 is applicable. The result would be forms like **grāmaṇaye* for the dat. and **grāmaṇes* for the abl. / gen., which are not desired. The substitution of *nā* for the sg. instr. ending by P. 7.3.120 would result in **grāmaṇinā*, which is not desired either. The insertion of *nUṬ* by P. 7.1.54 would give us **grāmaṇīnām* for the pl. gen. Also not desired. The substitution of *auṬ* by P. 7.3.119 in the sg. loc. would result in the undesired form **grāmaṇau*. The four rules mentioned here are neither specially prescribed for ntr. stems, nor for masc. stems, but merely for stems ending in short *i*. Since *puṃvadbhāva* is deemed to prohibit only the *nUM* operation, the application of the four rules results in undesired forms. Therefore they must be prohibited.

Vt. II says that P. 7.1.74 also prescribes the non-substitution of a short vowel. In other words, P. 7.1.74 also prohibits shortening. Thus the final *ī* of *grāmaṇī* is retained. Consequently, the four abovementioned operations are not applicable, but *yAṆ-ādeśa* is, by P. 6.4.81, that is, when *puṃvadbhāva* is applied. Otherwise, in the non-*puṃvadbhāva* alternative, we insert *nUM* by P. 7.1.73.

The difficulty before the *Vārttikakāra* is that the vowel shortening for neuter stems prescribed by P. 1.2.47 is not conditioned by the instr. endings, etc., which begin with a vowel. Therefore it cannot be prohibited by P. 7.1.74. The conclusion drawn by the *Vārttikakāra* is that the mention of *puṃvat* must also imply a prohibition of shortening by P. 1.2.47. Now what happens if both *nUM* and shotening are prohibited? In that case, the neuter paradigm will be : *grāmaṇī* + *ā*, and so on. Here the *aṅga* does not end in short *i*. That is a good thing, because it disposes of the prohibition of the four rules abovementioned. We simply apply *yAṆ-ādeśa* by P. 6.4.81.

Then comes *Vt.* III. It literally repeats *Vt.* III on P. 1.2.58. It says that we can manage on account of *arthātideśa*. So far the *Vārttikakāra* has assumed a different type of *atideśa*, namely, *kāryātideśa* 'transference / extension of grammatical operations.' In our case, the *kāryātideśa* amounted to a prohibition of two operations, namely, *nUM* and *hrasvatva* 'shortening.' That is what *puṃvat* implies. In fact, it implies the phrasing of two prohibition rules. Can we have the desired result in a different, less complicated way? *Vt.* III says, yes. We can manage by *arthātideśa*.

Literally, *arthātideśa* means 'transference / extension of meaning.' The term is used in *Vt.* III on P. 1.2.58. Here it refers to a transference or extension of number The use of the plural is extended to *jātiśabdas*. In *Vt.* XVIII on P. 1.1.56 the term *vacanātideśa* is used which directly means 'extension of number.' In his *bhāṣya* on

this *Vt*. Patañjali quotes *Vt*. III on P. 1.2.58. The term is also used in *Vt*. VII on P. 6.4.34. Here the question is of gender, namely, *puṃvadbhāva* of fem. forms. We may, therefore, assume that *arthātideśa* does not refer to meaning in the current sense, but to a particular grammatical meaning, namely, gender or number. In our case, since the question is of *puṃvadbhāva*, reference must be to gender.

Consider the following examples :

(1) *grāmaṇīḥ puruṣaḥ* 'a man who is the head of a vlllage'
(2) *grāmaṇīḥ strī* 'a woman who is the head of a village'
(3) *grāmaṇi brāhmaṇakulam* 'a brahmin family which is the head of a village'

In all three cases *grāmaṇī* is an adjective. It is also *bhāṣitapuṃska* because its *pravṛttinimitta* of the word *grāmaṇī*, namely, leadership of a village, is the same in all three cases. The three items mentioned share the same office. However, as far as the word *grāmaṇī* is concerned, there is a difference in gender, based on agreement with the following noun. In (1) and (2) the gender difference is not shown in the language form, but in (1) and (2) on the one hand, and (3) on the other, there is a difference.

If we take *puṃvat* in P. 7.1.74 to refer to *arthātideśa*, that is, to a transference of gender operations, it implies that, instead of of neuter gender operations, masculine gender operations are applied to the *bhāṣitapuṃska* word. But this is not a general transference. The transference is restricted to case endings from the instr. endings onwards, and to case endings which begin with a vowel. This being so, the *nUM* operation and the shortening operation, which are restricted to neuter adjectives by P. 7.1.73 and P. 1.2.47, are set aside. They make place for operations prescribed for the masc. gender. Once the *arthātideśa* view is accepted, operations applicable to ntr. stems are not applicable to the corresponding masc. stems. That absolves us from phrasing separate prohibitions for *nUM* and *hrasvatva*.

Vt. IV says that also a prohibition is to be stated of the *luk*-deletion of a *taddhita* suffix. The example is the form *pīlu* used in the expressions *pīluḥ vṛkṣaḥ* 'a *pīlu* tree,' and *pīlu phalam* 'a *pīlu* fruit.' Here *pīlu* is considered to be an adjectival word qualifying *vṛkṣa* and *phala*. The prohibition is of *puṃvadbhāva* on the assumption that *pīlu* is a *bhāṣitapuṃska* word.

The example is a tricky one, because it has to do with the apposition of two nouns in which it is not clear what qualifies what, rather than with attribution, adjectives qualifying nouns. We have a masc. word *pīlu* which refers to a tree, and

a ntr. word *pīlu* which refers to a fruit. In Sanskrit grammar the ntr. form *pīlu* is a *taddhita aÑ*-derivation by P. 4.3.139 in the sense of *vikāra* 'product.' The suffix is deleted by P. 4.3.163.

Now the question is whether *pīlu* is a *bhāṣitapuṃska* word, or not. For *pīlu* we have a form common to the neuter and the masc. in the sg. instr. *pīlunā*, but we also have the sg. gen. *pīlunaḥ*, which is typical of the neuter declension. Here, if *puṃvadbhāva* is applied, the resulting form would be *pīloḥ* (sc. *phalasya*), which is not desired. We want the application of *nUM* by P. 7.1.73. Therefore *puṃvadbhāva* must be prohibited, when *taddhitaluk* has taken place.

The position taken by *Vt*. IV reveals a different understanding of the term *bhāṣitapuṃska*. It assumes that, for a word to be called *bhāṣitapuṃska* and for the resulting *puṃvadbhāva*, the criterion is a common phonetic shape, shared by the ntr. stem and the masc. stem, like in the case of *pīlu*. This is the point answered and refuted by *Vt*. V.

Apart from this point, *Vt*. IV raises a problem of derivation. No etymology can be offered for *pīlu* which makes it clear that it is used to refer to a particular tree and to a fruit of that tree. In fact, both meanings should be considered to be conventional meanings in which the word *pīlu* is used. According to P. 1.2.54, in such cases there is no need for first assuming and then deleting a *taddhita* suffix, because the etymological connection between the word and the thing-meant is lost. Denotation of meaning belongs to lexicography, and should not be part of grammatical procedure. The case of *pīlu* is one of homonymy, the basic phonetic shape being the same, but the meaning being different. The meaning difference is further brought out by a gender difference.

Vt. V says that the prohibition proposed by *Vt*. IV is not required. The reason is that we understand *bhāṣitapuṃska* (and apply *puṃvadbhāva*), when there is a common *ākṛti*. See under 7, above. That is precisely lacking in the case of *pīlu*. The ntr. word *pīlu* has one *ākṛti*, the masc. word has another *ākṛti*. For the neuter word the *ākṛti* is *phalatva* 'being a fruit,' for the masc. word it is *vṛkṣatva* 'being a tree.' These are generic features inhering in individual items and known through the shared outward shape of the items. Thus the two words *pīlu*, although they have a common outward, phonetic shape, are not *bhāṣitapuṃska*. They are homonyms only.

Patañjali then rejects the *Vt*. by saying that we will understand what *bhāṣitapuṃska* means on account of the mention of *artha* in *Vt*. III.

7.1.75 ASTHI-DADHI-SAKTHY-AKṢṆĀM ANAṄ UDĀTTAḤ *'anAṄ*, which has high pitch, (comes) in place of (the last phoneme of the neuter nominal *aṅgas*) *asthi* "bone," *dadhi* "curds," *sakthi* "thigh" and *akṣi* "eye," (if case endings from the instr. endings onwards, which begin with a vowel, follow immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *anAṄ* after four specified nominal stems on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*napuṃsakānām āṅgānām*) *asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām* (*ajādiṣu tṛtīyādiṣu vibhaktiṣu*). Here *napuṃsakānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.72. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. As explained by the *KV*, the substitute *anAṄ* comes in place of *asthi*, etc. Thus here the gen. *°ākṣṇām* is taken as a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. Then, by P. 1.1.53, we interpret this in the sense that *anAṄ* comes in place of the last phoneme of *asthi*, etc. The construction, therefore is *°akṣṇām iti sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdiṣṭasya antyasya alaḥ sthāne anaṅ 'anAṄ* comes in place of the final phoneme of what is mentioned as as a technical gen. by the word *°aksnām*.' The word *bhāṣitapuṃskam* from P. 7.1.74 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*, because *asthi*, etc. are not adjectives. *Ajādiṣu* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.73. *Tṛtīyādiṣu* is continued from P. 7.1.74. *Vibhaktiṣu* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 7.1.73. The *vidheya* is *anAṄ udāttaḥ*. It discontinues *puṃvat gālavasya* from P. 7.1.74. The *anubandha Ṅ* indicates that the substitute (*anaṄ*) only replaces the final phoneme of the stems mentioned, by P. 1.1.53.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *asthnā* 'by means of a bone,' *asthne* 'for a bone,' *dadhnā* 'by means of curds,' *dadhne* 'for curds,' *sakthnā* 'by means of the thigh,' *sakthne* 'for the thigh,' *akṣṇā* 'by means of the eye,' and *akṣṇe* 'for the eye.'

According to Whitney, § 343 i, the stems *asthi*, *dadhi*, *sakthi* and *akṣi* are defective, taking complementing case forms from stems in *an*.

4. The *KV* notes that *asthi*, etc. have high pitch on the first syllable. Consequently, the final vowel is *anudātta* (P. 6.1.158). Therefore, by *sthānivadbhāva* (P. 1.1.56) the substitute *anaṄ* would be *anudātta* also. This is not desired, and that is why P. 7.1.75 specifically says that *anaṄ* is *udātta*. This being so, after the deletion of *a* has been applied by P. 6.4.134, because the stem is called *bha* by P. 1.4.18, the case ending becomes *udātta*, by P. 6.1.161.

The *prakriyā* of *asthnā́* is as follows :

(1)	*ásthi*	*Phiṭsūtra* 26
(2)	*ásthi* + *Ṭā*	P. 4.1.2
(3)	*asthán* + *ā*	P. 7.1.75
(4)	*asth°n* + *ā́*	P. 6.4.134; 6.1.161
	asthnā́.	

5. The *KV* notes that the mention of a word ending in that, namely, *asthi*, etc., is desired also for a non-neuter stem formed with the help of the ntr. words *asthi*, etc. Reference is to the *pbh.* mentioned in *PN* as *pbh.* 27. The *pbh.* says that in the *aṅga*-section grammatical operations are also applied to a stem ending in the word concerned. The examples quoted are the *bv.* cps *priyāsthnā* 'by one to whom bones are dear' and *priyadadhnā* 'by one to whom curds is dear.'

The *prakriyā* of *priyadadhnā* is as follows:

(1)	((*priya* + *Ṭā*) + (*dadhi* + *Ṭā*)) + *Ṭā*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	((*priya* + °) + (*dadhi* + °)) + *ā*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	*priyadadhan* + *ā*	P. 7.1.75
(4)	*priyadadh°n* + *ā*	P. 6.4.134

priyadadhnā, as in *priyadadhnā brāhmaṇena* 'by a brahmin to whom curds is dear.'

6. To point out the significance of the word *tṛtīyādiṣu* continued in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *asthinī* 'two bones' and *dadhinī* 'the two quantities of curds.' These are du. nom. / acc. forms. The corresponding undesired forms would be **asthanī* and **dadhanī*.

7. To make clear that the rule applies before *tṛtīyādi* case endings which begin with a vowel only, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *asthibhyām* 'with the bones' and *dadhibhyām* 'with the quantities of curds.' Here, if the *anAṄ*-substitution were applied, the result would be the undesired forms **asthabhyām* and **dadhabhyām*, after the application of P. 8.2.7.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.76 CHANDASY API DṚŚYATE 'in the Vedic language (*anAṄ*, having high pitch) is seen (elsewhere) also'

1. This is a statement noting a Vedic peculiarity in connection with the stems mentioned in P. 7.1.75. For *chandas*-rules see *AP* IX, p. 172-173, and, in

general, Kiparsky 1979, p. 56.

2. The rule itself contains neither *uddeśya* nor *vidheya*. What is *uddeśya* and *vidheya* is provided by the context, as (*napuṃsakānām aṅgānām asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām*) where *ajādiṣu tṛtīyādiṣu* and *vibhaktiṣu* are continued. For the explanation of the terms concerned see P. 7.1.75, under 2. For what is meant by *chandas* see *ATA*, n. 131. The *vidheya* is (*anAṄ udāttaḥ*), provided by P. 7.1.75.

The *KV* explains the meaning of *api* as *yato vihitas tato 'nyatra api* 'in other cases also than after which it has been prescribed.' Reference is to *anAṄ*.

3. The *KV* quotes examples according to three conditions stated in P. 7.1.75. These conditions do not hold good in the Vedic language, as follows :

(1) For *aci*, that is, *aj-ādiṣu*, that is, before other case endings than those beginning with a vowel :

indro dadhīco asthabhiḥ 'with the bones of Dadhyañc Indra (has defeated)' (ṚgV. 1.84.13) and *bhadraṃ paśyemākṣabhiḥ* 'may we see prosperity with our eyes' (*Vāj. S.* 25.21). Here the case ending begins with a consonant. The *n* in final position of *asthan* is deleted by P. 8.2.7.

(2) For *tṛtīyādiṣu*, that is, before other case endings than those from the instr. endings onwards :

asthāny utkṛtya juhoti 'he offers an oblation after having cut up the bones' (source unknown). Lengthening of the prefinal vowel in *asthāni* is by P. 6.4.8.

(3) For *vibhaktau*, that is, *vibhaktiṣu*, that is, before other suffixes than case endings :

akṣaṇvatā lāṅgalena 'with a plough having an eye' (source unknown) and *asthanvantaṃ yad anasthā bibharti* 'that the boneless one carries the one having bones' (ṚgV. 1.164.4). For *lāṅgala* see Agrawala ²1963, p. 199. Perhaps by *akṣaṇvat* reference is to a hole in the wooden pole of the plough. The suffix used in the examples is *matUP* (P. 5.2.94).

4. As noticed by Whitney, § 431a, the Vedic forms quoted are taken from stems in *an*, like *asthan*.

7.1.77 Ī CA DVIVACANE '(in the Vedic language) also long *ī* (having high pitch comes) in place of (the final phoneme of the *aṅgas asthi* 'bone,' *dadhi* 'curds,' *sakthi* 'thigh' and *akṣi* 'eye,') if a dual (case ending) follows immediately'

1. This is a statement noting another peculiarity of the stems mentioned in P. 7.1.75 in the Vedic language.

2. For the *uddeśya* see P. 7.1.76, under 2. Here *dvivacane* is to be added. For *dvivacana* see P. 1.4.102. It discontinues *ajādiṣu tṛtīyādiṣu* from P. 7.1.73 (*aci*) and 74. Whether *vibhaktau* from P. 7.1.73 is continued or not, makes no difference. The *KV* is silent on this point. The *vidheya* is *ī* (*udāttaḥ*) where *udāttaḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.75. It discontinues *anAṄ* from P. 7.1.75. The *ī* replaces the final phoneme of a *sthānin* by the *pbh.* P. 1.1.52.

The function of *ca* is to show connection with the previous rule. Both rules deal with *chandas*.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *akṣī te indre piṅgale kaper iva* 'your eyes, o Indra, are reddish, like (those) of a monkey' (*Śābarabhāsya* on *Jaimini-Mīmāṃsāsūtras* 2.1.32; borrowed from Patañjali), and *akṣībhyāṃ te nāsikābhyām* 'from your eyes, from your nose' (ṚgV. 10.163.1).

The *prakriyā* of the dual nom. / acc. *akṣī* is as follows :

(1) *akṣi* + *au*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *akṣi* + *ī*	P. 7.1.19
(3) *akṣī* + *ī*	P. 7.1.77
(4) *akṣī*	P. 6.1.102
akṣī.	

Here *akṣī* is *antodātta*. The prohibition of *pūrvasavarnadīrgha* by P. 6.1.105 is not applied because P. 7.1.77 deals with *chandas*. For *chandas* we have the maxim *dṛṣṭānuvidhiś chandasi* 'in the case of the Vedic language (first) see the form, (then) apply the rule.' Compare *Mbh*.I, p. 55, line 3.

4. The *KV* then raises the question of conflict. It notes that in *akṣī* the insertion of the augment *nUM* by P. 7.1.73 is blocked by the substitute *ī*, because this has been prescribed by the later rule. Reference is to the conflict procedure laid down by P. 1.4.2 and traditionally accepted as valid throughout the A. Then the question is of *punaḥprasaṅga* 're-applicability' of P. 7.1.73. Why not apply *nUM*

after the ī-substitution? That is rejected by invoking the *pbh*. stated as *PN*, *pbh*. 40. Compare P. 7.1.50, under 3.

The appeal to *paratva* as a conflict-solving principle in the A. was rejected by us long ago. See for instance *AP* IV, p. 15-20. One may wonder whether a conflict is possible between a non-Vedic rule and a Vedic rule. The A. contains rules specifically stated to be *chandas* rules. It also contains rules specifically stated to be valid for the *bhāṣā*, the spoken language known to Pāṇini. But the great majority of rules in the A. is neither marked as *chandas*, nor as *bhāṣā*. These are rules which hold for both, *chandas* and *bhāṣā*. P. 7.1.73 is such a rule. Since it holds for *chandas* also, a conflict with the *chandas* rule P. 7.1.77 is possible. It is to be solved by the *utsarga-apavāda* principle. See *AP* IV, p. 7-14. In relation to P. 7.1.73, the present rule, P. 7.1.77, is the special rule.

5. We have no *Vt*. on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Patañjali first discusses a technicality regarding P. 6.1.102. Then he proposes a *Vt*.-like statement which says that in the Vedic language *puṃvadbhāva* is applied to neuter forms. To have this meaning from P. 7.1.77, *puṃvat* is continued from P. 7.1.74, *napuṃsakasya* from P. 7.1.72, and *chandasi* from P. 7.1.76. The examples for the statement proposed are *madhor gṛbhṇāmi* 'I partake of honey,' and *madhos tṛptā ivāsate* 'satisfied, as it were, with honey, they remain.' Instead of the neuter form *madhunaḥ*, in which *nUM* is applied, the text shows the masc. form *madhoḥ*. The genitives in the examples are partitive genitives. See Whitney, § 297 b. Finally, Patañjali rejects the statement proposed by saying that, anyway, *puṃvadbhāva* is the topic of discussion. See P. 7.1.74 which mentions *puṃvat*. So we can continue it in P. 7.1.77 itself.

7.1.78 NĀBHYASTĀC CHATUḤ '(the augment *nUM* does) not (become) part of *ŚatṚ* following after a reduplicated verbal base (*aṅga*)'

1. This is a *pratiṣedhasūtra* prohibiting the insertion of *nUM* in the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *abhyastāt* (*aṅgāt*) *śatuḥ*. The term *abhyasta* is defined by P. 6.1.5. It refers to a reduplicated verbal base together with the reduplication. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *ŚatṚ* is the present participle suffix introduced by P. 3.4.124 as a substitute for *lAṬ*, in the sense of *kartṛ* 'agent' by P. 3.4.67. Between the verbal base and *ŚatṚ* the *vikaraṇa ŚaP* intervenes. *ŚatR* is a *sārvadhātuka* suffix by P. 3.4.113. The *anubandha Ṛ* is added to show that *ŚatṚ* is *ugit*. Therefore *nUM* is inserted before the *sarvanāmasthāna* endings by P. 7.1.70. Since *ŚatR* is *ugit*, the fem. suffix *ṄīP* is added after forms

ending in *ŚatṚ* by P. 4.1.6. The gen. form *śatuḥ* is taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* 'a gen. ending indicating a part (of a whole)' by P. 2.3.50. The word *sarvanāmasthāne* from P. 7.1.70 is not continued, on the basis of *sāmarthya*. The point is that the prohibition of *nUM* is possible before *sarvanāmasthāna* endings only. The word *dvivacane* from P. 7.1.77 is discontinued for the same reason. So also the word *chandasi* from P. 7.1.76. The *vidheya* is (*nUM*) *na*, where *nUM*, continued from P. 7.1.58-73, is implied.

3. One may wonder why the present rule does not prohibit the *vidheya* *Ī* from P. 7.1.77. As noted by the *Nyāsa*, referring to what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 61, a rule only prescribes or prohibits what is nearest to it in some other rule. The answer is the *Ī*-substitution prescribed by P. 7.1.77 for *asthi*, etc. is not applicable at all in connection with *ŚatṚ*. Then what could be prohibited by P. 7.1.78? The only possible candidate is *nUM*. For *nUM* we have to go back to P. 7.1.70, but this is not a question of *anuvṛtti*, or *maṇḍūkapluti*. Rather it is a question of *sāmarthya* in the sense that it is the only solution which makes sense logically.

The following illustration may be offered. Suppose we have the following sequence of prescriptions :

i. *pratidinam odanaḥ bhaktavyaḥ prātaḥ* 'every day porridge is to be eaten in the morning'

ii. *snānaṃ kartavyam* 'a bath is to be taken'

iii. *adhyayanam aparāhne* 'study in the afternoon'

iv. *śanivāsare vastrāṇi prakṣalanīyāni* 'on Saturday clothes are to be washed'

v. *ekādaśyāṃ na bhaktavyaḥ* 'on *ekādaśī* it is not to be eaten'

Here in ii. *pratidinam* and *prātaḥ* are continued. In iii. *prātaḥ* is discontinued. In iv. *pratidinam* is discontinued. But what is to be continued in v., so that the prohibition makes sense? The answer can only be *odanaḥ* from i, in spite of the intervening prescriptions.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *dadat* 'one who gives,' *dadatau* 'the two who give,' *dadataḥ* 'the ones who give;' *dadhat* 'one who places;' *dadhatau* 'the two who place,' *dadhatah* 'the ones who place;' *jakṣat* 'one who eats,' *jakṣatau* 'the two who eat,' *jakṣataḥ* 'the ones who eat;' *jāgrat* 'one who is awake,' *jāgratau* 'the

two who are awake' and *jāgrataḥ* 'the ones who are awake.' For *jakṣ-* as the reduplicated form of *ghas-* see Whitney, § 102 a.

The *prakriyā* of *dadat* is as follows :

(1)	*ḌU dāÑ-*	*Dhp*. 3.9
(2)	*dā* + *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3)	*dā* + *ŚatṚ*	P. 3. 4.124
(4)	*dā* + *ŚaP* + *at*	P. 3.1.68
(5)	*dā* + ° + *at*	P. 2.4.75
(6)	*dā* + *dā* + *at*	P. 6.1.10
(7)	*da* + *dā* + *at*	P. 7.4.59
(8)	*da* + *d°* + *at*	P. 6.4.112 (*abhyasta*)
(9)	*dadat* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(10)	*dadat* + °	P. 6.1.68
	dadat.	

At stage (10) the augment *nUM* is applicable by P. 7.1.70 on the basis of *pratyayalakṣaṇatva* (P. 1.1.62), because *dadat*, being *ŚatṚ-anta*, is *ugit*. It is pro-hibited by the present rule.

The *prakriyā* of *dadhat*, starting from (1) *dhā- Dhp*. 3.10, follows the same pattern as *dadat*.

The *prakriyā* of *jakṣat*, starting from (1) *jakṣA- Dhp*. 2.62, follows the same pattern as *dadat*, except for the reduplication stages (6)-(8). because *jakṣ-* is itself a reduplicated verbal base.

The *prakriyā* of *jāgrat*, starting from : (1) *jāgṛ- Dhp*. 2.63, follows the same pattern as *jakṣat*. In stage (8), after the *luk*-deletion of *ŚaP*, *guṇa* is applicable to the verbal base vowel *ṛ* in final position by P. 7.3.84. But since *ŚatṚ* is *sārvadhātuka*, it is *apit* by P. 1.2.4. Being *apit*, it is considered to be *Ṅit* by the same rule. Being *Ṅit*, it prohibits *guṇa* of the preceding vowel by P. 1.1.5 and by P. 7.3.85. The vowel *ṛ* is replaced by the semivowel *r* by P. 6.1.77.

5. Referring to Patañjali's *bhāṣya*, the *KV* says that the prohibition stated by the present rule concerns *nUM*, although it comes after several other rules have intervened since P. 7.1.58.

6. We have no *Vt*. on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. The question before Patañjali is, how to argue the continuation of *nUM* from P. 7.1.58, valid up to P. 7.1.73, inclusive. In this connection the *Nyāsa* refers to what has become *PN*, *pbh*.61. The *pbh*. says that a rule only prescribes or prohibits what is nearest to it. The point is that in P. 7.1.78 only *nUM* can be continued, not *puṃvadbhāva* from P. 7.1.74, nor *anAṄ* from P. 7.1.75-76, nor *Ī* from P. 7.1.77, for different reasons. According to the *Nyāsa*, this is not a matter of *maṇḍūkapluti* (for which see *FANU*, p. 208), as Patañjali may have thought. The prohibition by P. 7.1.78 can be of *nUM* only, and that is a matter of *sāmarthya*, as explained above. *Na* in P. 7.1.78 must necessarily mean *na nUN*.

At the end of his *bhāṣya* Patañjali says that, once *nUM* is continued in P. 7.1.78, it can be continued in P. 7.1.79 and in 80 also. Therefore *nUM* need not be separately mentioned in the latter rule. But see P. 7.1.80, under 2.

7.1.79 VĀ NAPUṂSAKASYA '(*nUM*) preferably (does) not (become part of *SatṚ*) in the neuter gender (after a reduplicated verbal base *aṅga*, (if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the non-preferred insertion of the augment *nUM* for the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*abhyastāt aṅgāt śatuḥ*) *napuṃsakasya* (*sarvanāmasthāne*). Here *abhyastāt śatuḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.78. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. For *napuṃsaka* see P. 7.1.19, under 2. For the continuation of *sarvanāmasthāne* from P. 7.1.70 see P. 7.1.78, under 2. The *KV* does not mention it. The *vidheya* is (*na*) *vā*, where *na* is continued from P. 7.1.78. For the continuation of *na* in an immediately following rule containing an option word see Kiparsky 1979, p. 10-11, and *FANU*, p. 116-118. The *KV* does not continue *na*, and therefore takes the *nUM*-forms to be merely optional forms.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *dadati / dadanti kulāni* 'families who give;' *dadhati / dadhanti kulāni* 'families who place;' *jakṣati / jakṣanti kulāni* 'families who eat;' and *jāgrati / jāgranti kulāni* 'families who are awake.' Here the non-*nUM* forms stated are the preferred forms.

For the *prakriyās* see the one given for *dadat* on P. 7.1.78, under 3. Only add the neuter pl. ending *Śi* by P. 7.1.20 instead of *sU* in stage (10).

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.80 ĀCCHĪNADYOR NUM '*nUM* (becomes preferably part of *ŚatṚ* after a verbal base *aṅga* ending in) short or long *a*, if *Śī* or (a) *nadī* (suffix) follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the preferable insertion of *nUM* in *ŚatR*. The important condition is that the verbal base *aṅga* before *ŚatṚ* must end in *a* or *ā*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ādantāt* (*aṅgāt śatuḥ*) *śīnadyoḥ*. *Āt* is a technical abl. by P. 1.1.67. Here *a* includes its *savarṇa* variety *ā* also, by P. 1.1.69. *Āt* is interpretated as *adantāt* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P.6.1.4. *Aṅga* here is understood in the sense of a verbal base plus *vikaraṇa*. *Śatuḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.78. Compare also P. 7.1.70. *Napuṃsakasya* from P. 7.1.89. is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya*. It makes no sense to continue it. After a *napuṃsaka* stem a *nadī* suffix cannot be added. *Śīnadyoḥ* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. *Śī* is the du. nom. / acc. ending by P. 7.1.20. *Nadī* is the designation of the fem. suffixes *ī* and *ū* by P. 1.4.3. The relevant fem. suffix for P. 7.1.80 is *ī* only, that is, *ṄīP*, by P. 4.1.6.

The *vidheya* is *nUM* (*vā*). The *KV*, which has not continued *na* in P. 7.1.79, continues *vā* from P. 7.2.79 in the present rule, and, therefore, takes the *nUM*-forms to be merely optional ones. Kiparsky 1979, p. 10, also discontinues *na*. He says 'The negation *na*, which was carried over into 79 from 78, is cancelled in 80 by the repetition of *nUM*. Accordingly, 7.1.80...says that *ŚatR* preferably does get *nUM* in the environment mentioned....' That also explains the function of the explicit mention on *nUM* in the rule.

The option between *the at* and *ant* forms is dealt with by Whitney, §§ 443-449.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *tudatī / tudantī kule* 'the two families who strike,' *tudatī / tudantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who strikes,' *yātī / yāntī kule* 'the two families who go,' *yātī / yāntī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahnin woman who goes,' *kariṣyatī / kariṣyantī kule* 'the two families who will do' and *kariṣyatī /kariṣyantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who will do.' For the formations concerned compare Whitney, § 443 a. Here the accent of the non-*nUM* forms is *antodātta* by P. 6.1.173, and that of the *nUM*-forms is *udātta* on the prefinal syllable, by P. 8.2.5.

The derivation of the ntr. du. nom. / acc. form *tudatī* is as follows :

(1)	tudA-		Dhp. 6.1
(2)	tud	+ lAṬ	P. 3.2.123
(3)	tud	+ ŚatṚ	P. 3.2.124
(4)	tud + Śa + at		P. 3.1.77

Since the *vikaraṇa Śa* is *apit*, it is *Ṅit* by P. 1.2.4. Therefore *guṇa*, applicable by P. 7.3.84, is not applied to the verbal base vowel by P. 1.1.5.

(5)	tud + at		P. 6.1.97
(6)	tudat	+ au	P. 4.1.2
(7)	tudat	+ ŚĪ	P. 7.1.19
	tudatī.		

Here the verbal base *aṅga* before *ŚatṚ* is *tuda*. It ends in *a*. Therefore P. 7.1.80 applies, and we can apply *nUM*. That gives us the preferred form *tudantī*.

The *prakriyā* of the fem. sg. nom. form *kariṣyantī* is as follows:

(1)	ḌU krÑ-		Dhp. 8.10
(2)	kṛ + lṚṬ		P. 3.3.13
(3)	kṛ + SatṚ		P. 3.2.124
(4)	kṛ + sya + at		P. 3.1.33
(5)	kṛ + iṬ + sya + at		P. 7.2.35
(6)	kar + i + sya + at		P. 7.3.84
(7)	kar + i + syat		P. 6.1.97
(8)	karisyat	+ ṄīP	P. 4.1.6
(9)	karisya-nUM-t	+ ī	P. 7.1.80
(10)	kariṣyant	+ ī	P. 8.3.59
	kariṣyantī.		

Here the verbal base *aṅga* before *ŚatR* is *karisya*. It ends in *a*. Therefore P. 7.1.80 applies, and we need not apply *nUM* in stage (9). That gives us the non-preferred form *kariṣyatī*.

4. Referring to Patañjali's *bhāṣya* on the rule, the *KV* then enters into a grammatical discussion. Here the *KV* briefly mentions the opinions of grammarians referred to as *kecit* 'some' and *apare* 'others.' The use of *kecit* is indicative of disapproval. See *ANA*, n. 296. The discussion is better treated after Patañjali's *bhāṣya*. For the *KV* see further under 7, 8 and 9.

5. To point out the significance of the word *āt* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *kurvatī* and *sunvatī*. Here, since the verbal base *aṅgas kuru* and *sunu* do not end in *a* / *ā*, no option for *nUM* is available.

To point out the significance of *śīnadyoḥ*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *tudatām* 'of those who strike' and *nudatām* 'of those who push.' Here neither *Śī* nor the *nadī* suffix *ī* is added.

6. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Patañjali opens his *bhāṣya* by asking why doesn't P. 7.1.80 apply in *adatī* 'the two (ntr. items) who/which eat' / 'a female who/which eats,' *ghnatī* 'the two (ntr. items) who/which kill' / 'a female who/which kills,' *lunatī* 'the two (ntr. items) who/which mow' / 'a female who mows' and *punatī* 'the two (neuter items) who/which clean' / 'a female who cleans.' The answer is that after the deletion applied to the respective *vikaraṇas* the verbal base *aṅga* no longer ends in *a* / *ā*. Patañjali then quotes *yātī*/ *yāntī* 'the two (ntr. items) who/which go' / 'a female who/which goes' as a correct example.

Adatī is derived from *ad-* (*Dhp.* 2.1). The same holds for *lunatī*, derived from *lū-* (*Dhp.* 9.13) and *punatī*, derived from *pū-* (*Dhp.* 9.12). Only here the *vikaraṇa* is *Śnā* (P. 3.1.81), where the *ā* is deleted before a *sārvadhātuka* suffix by P. 6.4.112. Shortening of the verbal base vowel is by P. 7.3.80.

The *prakriyā* of the ntr. du. nom. / acc. form *ghnatī* is as follows :

(1) *hanA-*				*Dhp.* 2.2
(2) *han*		+ *lAṬ*		P. 3.2.123
(3) *han*		+ *ŚatṚ*		P. 3.2.124
(4) *han*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *at*		P. 3.1.68
(5) *han*	+ °	+ *at*		P. 2.4.72
(6) *h°n*		+ *at*		P. 6.4.98
(7) *ghn*		+ *at*		P. 7.3.54
(8) *ghnat*			+ *au*	P. 4.1.2
(9) *ghnat*			+ *ī*	P. 7.1.19
ghnatī.				

In all of these examples the verbal base *aṅga* before *ŚatṚ*, after the deletion or partial deletion of the *vikaraṇa*, does not end in *a* / *ā*. Therefore P. 7.1.80 is not applicable, and we don't have an optional *nUM* form.

The *prakriyā* of the fem. sg. nom. form *yāntī* is as follows :

(1)	*yā-*	*Dhp.* 2.40
(2)	*yā* + *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3)	*yā* + *ŚatṚ*	P. 3.2.124
(4)	*yā* + *ŚaP* + *ŚatṚ*	P. 3.1.68
(5)	*yā* + ° *at*	P. 2.4.72
(6)	*y* *āt*	P. 6.1.101
(7)	*yāt* + *ṄīP*	P. 4.1.6
(8)	*yā-nUM-t* + *ī*	P. 7.1.80
	yāntī.	

Here the verbal base *aṅga* before *ŚatṚ*, after the deletion of the *vikaraṇa*, does end in *ā*. Therefore P. 7.1.80 applies, and we do have an optional *nUM* form.

7. However, in *yāntī* , as well as in *tudatī* and *kariṣyantī*, a difficulty arises. It arises in that stage of the *prakriyā* in which P. 6.1.97 and P. 6.1.101 are applicable, both of them *ekādeśa* 'single substitution' rules. Here the *KV* uses the phrase *antaraṅgatvād ekādeśe kṛte* 'when single substitution is applied on account of the fact that (both rules) are *antaraṅga*.' The idea is that the two rules are *antaraṅga*, because they are concerned with the internal *aṅga* only. They do not require a neuter or fem. ending for their operation. Being *antaraṅga*, they prevail, namely, over the *nUM* insertion, which is conditioned by an outside ntr. or fem. suffix. As a matter of fact, the reasoning by the *KV* is wrong, because the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* relation does not apply within a single word derivation. See *AP* IV, p. 31-33.

Now, to continue the *KV*'s comment, the difficulty is that after the application of the *ekādeśa* rules we cannot clearly show where the *aṅga* ends and where the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* starts. There is just one substitute vowel, *a* or *ā*. Here P. 6.1.85 comes to our help. It says that the single substitute is treated like the final of the preceding linguistic unit, or like the initial of the following unit. In our case, this means that the single substitute vowel may have the property of *avarṇāntāṅgatva* 'belonging to an *aṅga* which ends in *a* / *ā*,' as well as that of *parādivarṇatva* 'being a phoneme which comes at the beginning of the following element,' in our case *ŚatṚ*. So a difference (*vyapavarga*) does exist in that same *a* / *ā*. Therefore we can apply *nUM* by P. 7.1.80.

But there is a *pbh.* which says *ubhayata āśraye nāntādivat* 'when dependence is on both (being *anta* of the preceding *aṅga* as well as being *ādi* of the following element) (simultaneously), the *antādivat*(-*sūtra* is) not (to be invoked).' For the *pbh.*

(not in *PN*) see *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. 22 (No. 40 in the *Vyāḍikṛtaparibhāṣā-sūcanam*), and p. 88 (No. 30 in the *Jainendraparibhāṣāvṛtti*). The point of the *pbh.* is that we cannot assign contradictory properties (*antatva* and *āditva*) to one element at the same time. Patañjali answers that dependence cannot be on both simultaneously. Then what? Patañjali in a rather obscure statement says that we do not understand in this way that *nUM* becomes part of *ŚatR* after a verbal base *anga* ending in *a* / *ā*, but that *nUM* comes after *a*, if that *a* is the immediately preceding sound of *ŚatṚ*. This can only be taken to mean that *a* is the immediately preceding sound of *t* of *ŚatṚ*.

To explain, the sequence under discussion is *a* / *ā* + *at* (of *ŚatṚ*). Here, according to Patañjali, we do not interpret P. 7.1.80 to mean that *nUM* is inserted in *at*, if *ŚatṚ* comes after a verbal base *aṅga* ending in *a* / *ā*, but that *nUM* is inserted, if there is an *a* which immediately precedes the *t* of *ŚatṚ*. After the *ekādeśa* operation, what is left of the sequence *a* / *ā* + *at* is either *at* or *āt*. Both may be indicated as *at* where *a* stands for its *savarṇa* varieties also. Here we have a vowel *a* which immediately precedes, namely, the *t*, which is part of *SatṚ*. Therefore P. 7.1.80 can be applied.

The word *śatuḥ*, continued from P. 7.1.78, was taken as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*: *nUM* becomes part of *ŚatṚ*. That happens on two conditions, (1) there must be a verbal base *aṅga* ending in *a* / *ā*, and (2) *ŚĪ* or a *nadī* suffix must follow immediately after *ŚatṚ*. Patañjali is concerned with the first condition only. To evade the difficulty caused by the *ekādeśa* operation, Patañjali slightly changes the meaning of *śatuḥ*. As is clear from the *KV* and the explanation provided by the *Nyāsa*, it does no longer stand for the suffix *ŚatṚ* as a whole, but for a part of *ŚatṚ*, namely, *t*. Accordingly, P. 7.1.80 becomes applicable, if *a* / *ā* of the verbal base *aṅga* after the *ekādeśa* operation is followed immediately by the *t* of *ŚatṚ*.

8. This is the argument referred to in the *KV* by means of the word *kecit*. The *KV* summarizes the argument in three points : (1) We cannot justifiably say that there is an *antādivat*-relation between the final of the verbal base *aṅga* and the initial of the following suffix *ŚatṚ*, because there is no difference between the two once the single substitution has been applied. There is just one vowel. (2) We cannot have recourse to P. 6.1.85, because of the *pbh. ubhayata āśraye nāntādivat*. (3) If we have recourse to *bhūtapūrvagati* 'the understanding of an earlier stage (in the derivation, before the *ekādeśa* operation),' then P. 7.1.80 would overapply in the forms *adatī* and *ghnatī*. As a possible remedy for the difficulties mentioned, the *KV* refers to the opinion attributed to *kecit* 'some,' meaning Patañjali, and stated as *śatur avayave śatṛśabdo bhavati, avarṇāntād aṅgād uttaro yaḥ śatravayava iti* 'the word *ŚatṚ*

is used in the sense of a part of *ŚatṚ*, (that is, that) part of *ŚatṚ* which comes immediately after an *aṅga* which ends in *a*.'

What does this view amount to? We repeat. It amounts to this that for the application of *nUM* we do not require the sequence *a* / *ā* + *at*. We will interpret P. 7.1.80 to mean that *nUM* is inserted after an *aṅga* ending in *a* / *ā*, if the *a* / *ā* belongs to an *aṅga* (or is part of an *aṅga*), and if that *aṅga* is followed by the *t* which is part of *ŚatṚ*. Thus the sequence required for adding *nUM* by P. 7.1.80 is not *a* / *ā* + *at*, but *a* / *ā* + *t*. Here, since *a* / *ā* is part of an *aṅga*, and since *t* is part of *ŚatṚ*, we have no difficulty in applying P. 7.1.80, even after *ekādeśa* is applied. The single resulting *a* can be regarded as *pūrvasya antavat* 'like the final of the preceding (*aṅga*)' by P. 6.1.85. Obviously, as explained by the *Nyāsa*, this view depends on interpreting both *aṅgasya* and *śatuḥ* as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*.

Why not assume *bhūtapūrvagati*? The difficulty here is that, instead of deriving the forms *adatī* and *ghnatī*, we would derive the *nUM* forms **adantī* and **ghnantī* where the application of P. 7.1.80 is not desired. The verbal bases concerned are the second conjugation class bases *ad-* and *han-*. Here, taking into account an earlier derivational stage, namely, the one in which the *vikaraṇa ŚaP* is added by P. 3.1.68 before it is deleted by P. 2.4.72, we would have the stages *ad* + *a* + *at* and *han* + *a* + *at*. Here P. 7.1.80 is applicable with the undesired result stated. Therefore assuming *bhūtapūrvagati* does not work.

9. Then the *KV* refers to another opinion, attributed to *apare* 'others.' *Apare* who? We can only guess. According to this opinion, in P. 7.1.80 *śī* and *nadī* only are qualified by *āt*. Thus, in the words of the *KV*, the rule is taken to mean *avarṇāntad aṅgād uttare ye śīnadyau tayoḥ parataḥ śatrantasya nuṃ bhavati* '*nUM* becomes part of (the unit) ending in *ŚatR* before those *śī* and *nadī* which follow after an *aṅga* ending in *a* / *ā*.' We note the sequential order expressed by means of a technical abl. in *aṅgād uttare ye śīnadyau* and by means of a technical loc. in *tayoḥ parataḥ*. The order is one of immediate sequence. Intervention by another element is not allowed.

As explained by the *Nyāsa*, that creates a difficulty in all forms, because everywhere the *t* of *ŚatṚ* intervenes. An example is the optionally allowed form *tudantī* 'the two items which strike' (ntr. du. nom. acc.) / 'the female who strikes.' The sequence concerned is *tud* + *ŚaP* + *ŚatṚ* + *ŚĪ* / *nadī*. Here, after the *ekādeśa* operation, *t* intervenes between the *aṅga tuda* and *ŚĪ* / *nadī*. The same holds good for *yāti* / *yānti*. Therefore P. 7.1.80 cannot become applicable, although it is desired. To obviate this difficulty, the *KV* quotes a *jñāpaka* statement from the *Mbh.* on P.

7.3.44 (*Mbh.* III, p.324, line 11). It reads *yena nāvyavadhānaṃ tena vyavahite 'pi vacanaprāmāṇyāt* '(a rule is applied) on the strength of its being stated, in spite of an element which intervenes, if its intervention cannot be avoided.' Hereby, since the intervention of *t* necessarily takes place, P. 7.1.80 is applied, which gives us the desired optional form *tudantī*.

10. To point out the significance of the word *āt* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *kurvatī* 'the two items which do' (ntr. du. nom. / acc.) / the female who does' and *sunvatī* 'the two items which press out' (ntr. du. nom. / acc.) / 'the female who presses out.' Here the verbal base *aṅga* (inclusive the *vikaraṇa*) does not end in *a* / *ā*.

To point out the significance of the word *śīnadyoḥ*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *tudatām* 'of those who strike' and *nudatām* 'of those who push.' Here there is no question of the endings *Śī* or *nadī*.

11. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a short *bhāṣya*. For its contents see under 6 and 7, above.

12. Let us reconsider the *apare* part of the *KV's* comment. As noted by the *Nyāsa* (*KV*, Benares ed., Vol. V, p. 627), the *KV* applies the designation *aṅga* twice, to two different linguistic segments. The question is, which segments. They are (1) the original *aṅga* consisting of a verbal base ending in *a* / *ā* followed by *ŚatṚ*, and (2) the original *aṅga* followed by *Śī* / *nadī*. Here the *KV* goes wrong, and, as a result, ties itself in knots. The two different linguistic elements should be analyzed as (1) the original *aṅga* consisting of a verbal base ending in *a* / *ā* followed by *ŚatṚ*, and (2) an extended *aṅga* consisting of a verbal base ending is *a* / *ā* + *ŚatṚ*, followed by *Śī* / *nadī*. Here first an immediate sequence is between the verbal base *aṅga* and *ŚatṚ*, and, secondly, between the extended *aṅga* including *ŚatṚ* and the endings mentioned.

The simple way to the latter analysis is to adopt the *padasaṃskārapakṣa* in which the *pada*-forming elements are put side by side. See *VIBHA*, Introduction, p. i, v-vi. Our example is *yātī* 'the female who goes.' We analyse the form as ((*yā* + *ŚatR*) + *ṄīP*)) + *sU*. Here we can show that *at* (of *ŚatṚ*) follows after an *aṅga* which ends in *a* / *ā*, and that *at* is followed by *ī*. At this stage two rules become applicable, P. 6.1.101 for *savarṇadīrgha* and P. 7.1.80 for *nUM*. The *nUM* rule is a wordbuilding rule, and should prevail over the sound-substitution rule. See *AP* IV, p. 234, and *AP* IX, p. 19 (under 5). Therefore we derive the stage ((*yā* + *a-nUM-t*) + *ī*)) + *sU*. Now the substitution rule P. 6.1.101 is applied. That gives us (*yānt*

+ Ī) + sU, and finally *yāntī*. This analysis based on the *padasaṃskāra*-view exposes the flaw in the opinion assigned to *apare* and renders the discussion concerned in the *KV* redundant.

13. Then, one may ask, what is the net value of the *KV*'s comment on the present rule? In the exposition of the opinion ascribed to *kecit*, the *antaraṅga-pbh.* is wrongly applied, and in the exposition of the opinion ascribed to *apare* a wrong word analysis is provided. Therefore, in the present case the net value of the *KV*'s comment consists in the correct explanation of the rule and in the examples quoted. The rest is an obtuse grammatical discussion.

7.1.81 ŚAPŚYANOR NITYAM '(*nUM* becomes) invariably (part of *ŚatR*) after a verbal base *aṅga* ending in) *ŚaP* or *ŚyaN*, (if *ŚĪ* or a *nadī* suffix follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the invariable insertion of *nUM* in *ŚatṚ*, on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *śapśyanoḥ* (*aṅgayoḥ śatuḥ śīnadyoḥ*). *ŚaP* and *ŚyaN* are the present tense *vikaraṇas* prescribed by P. 3.1.68 and 69 (for the conjugation class IV verbal bases). It discontinues *āt* from P. 7.1.80. *Aṅgayoḥ* is a technical ablative (P. 1.1.67) ending in *-os*. Compare P. 7.1.56, under 2. It is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma)* from P. 6.4.1. Like in P. 7.1.80 the term *aṅga* is understood in the sense of a verbal base + *vikaraṇa*. The word *aṅgayoḥ* is qualified by *śapśyanoḥ*, which is interpreted as *śapśyannantayoḥ* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). *Śatuḥ* is continued as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* from P. 7.1.78. *Śīnadyoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.80.

The *vidheya* is *nUṂ nityam*. The word *nityam* cancels *vā* continued from P. 7.1.79. Option *words* are *con*tinued as long as the same *vidheya* continues. See *FANU*. p. 272, convention 4. In our case, this would imply that *vā* is continued up to P. 7.1.82, inclusive. This is not desired. *NUM* is continued from P. 7.1.80, and earlier from P. 7.1.58. See P. 7.1.78, under 2.

3. The examples provided by the *KV* are

(1) For *ŚaP* :

pacantī kule 'the two families who cook' and *pacantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who cooks'

(2) For *ŚyaN*:

dīvyantī kule 'the two families who gamble,' *dīvyantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who gambles,' *sīvyantī kule* 'the two families who sew' and *sīvyantī brāhmaṇī* 'a brahmin woman who sews.' Lengthening of the verbal base vowel is by P. 8.2.76. Single substitution in the sequence *a* + *at* is by P. 6.1.97.

4. The *KV* notes that the mention of *nityam* serves to stop the continuation of *vā* in P. 7.1.81. See under 2, above. Referring to Patañjali's *bhāṣya*, the *KV* says that here, on the strength of the very phrasing of the present rule (*ārambhasāmarthyāt*) one might in doubt whether the option itself is continued in the rules following after *nityam*. The idea is that, if *vā* were continued in the present rule, P. 7.1.81 would be redundant, because the optional forms could be taken care of by P. 7.1.80. Therefore the mention of *nityam* is not really required in P. 7.1.81. But since P. 7.1.81 has been phrased with *nityam*, this can only mean that in the subsequent rules also *vā* is not continued. That is to say, any option is disallowed.

5. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya*. Patañjali argues that for the discontinuation of *vā* the mention of *nityam* in P. 7.1.81 is not required. We can manage *pacantī* as an optional form by P. 7.1.80. Therefore, to disallow the alternative **pacatī*, we wil say that on the strength of the phrasing of the rule P. 7.1.81 the option must have been cancelled. But, apparently, the argument is over-ingenious even to Patañjali's taste. He finally declares that the mention of *nityam* is *sāṇnyāsika* 'part of the original text.' Therefore let it be there, no harm done.

7.1.82 SĀV ANAḌUHAḤ '*nUM* (becomes) part of (the nominal base *aṅga*) *anaḍuḥ* "draught-animal, bullock," if *sU* follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *nUM* for *anaḍuḥ*, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *anaḍuhaḥ* (*aṅgasya*) *sau*. Here *anaḍuhaḥ* is an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. It discontinues *śapśyanoḥ* from P. 7.1.81. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. The word *śatuḥ* from P. 7.1.78 is discontinued in the ground of *sāmarthya*. Obviously, it makes no sense to continue the participle suffix *ŚatṚ* in a rule dealing with a nominal base *aṅga*. *Sau* is the technical loc. by P. 1.1.66 of the sg. nom. and voc. case ending (P. 2.3.47) *sU*. It discontinues *śīnadyoḥ* from P. 7.1.80. The *vidheya* is *nUM*, continued from P. 7.1.80, and earlier from P. 7.1.58. See P. 7.1.78, under 2.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are the sg. nom. *anaḍvān* 'a bullock' and the sg. vocative *he anaḍvan* 'o bullock'. The *prakriyā* of the sg. nom. form is as follows :

(1) *anaḍuh* + *sU* P. 4.1.2

At this stage two rules apply at the same time, P. 6.1.68, for deleting the case ending, and P. 7.1.98 for inserting *āM* in *anaduh*. Here, since P. 6.1.68 is the environment changing rule, it prevails by the *siddha*-principle See *AP* I, p. 85 - 90.

(2) *anaḍuh*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(3) *anaḍu-nUM-h*		P. 7.1.82; 1.1.47; 1.1.62
(4) *anaḍuānh*		P. 7.1.98
(5) *anaḍvānh*		P. 6.1.77
(6) *anaḍvān°*		P. 8.2.23
anaḍvān.		

Foe the inflection of *anaḍuḥ* compare Whitney, § 404. Compare also P. 7.1.98.

4. The *KV* then quotes two opinions ascribed to *kecit* 'some (grammarians)' and *apare* 'others.' For the use of *kecit* and *apare* see P. 7.1.80, under 4. The *keçit*-opinion refers to the view stated by *Vt*. II on the present rule, as explained by Patañjali. It is briefly summed up as saying that *nUM* is added once *āM* and *aM* have been inserted in *anaḍuh* by P. 7.1.98 and 99, because *āt* is continued from P. 7.1.80. Therefore *aM* and *āM* are not blocked by *nUM*, and *nUM* is inserted after *am* and *āM* have been added. There is no *bādhyabādhaka*-relation between the two augments.

The *apare*-opinion refers to the alternative view stated by *Vt*. III, part 1, on the present rule. It is briefly summed up as saying that, given the general-special relation between the rules prescribing *aM* / *āM* on the one hand, and the rule prescribing *nUM* on the other, what is desired is *samāveśa* 'the joint application' of *aM* / *āM* and *nUM*. Here also there is no *bādhyabādhaka*-relation between *aM* / *āM* and *nUM*. Similar cases of joint application are *cicīṣati* 'he desires to pile up,' etc., where there is no *bādhyabādhaka*-relation between lengthening and reduplication. Both are applied. Accordingly, we can first apply *āM* / *am* and then *nUM*.

The *prakriyā* of *cicīṣati* is as follows :

(1)	*ciÑ-*	*Dhp.* 5.5
(2)	*ci + saN*	P. 2.1.7 (no *guṇa*, by P. 1.1.5, because *saN* is *kit*, P. 1.1.5)

At this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously, P. 6.4.16 for lengthening of the verbal base vowel, and P. 6.1.9 for reduplication. Here P. 6.4.16, being the special rule, prevails by the *utsarga-apavāda* principle. See *AP* IV, p. 19-20.

(3)		*cī + sa*				P. 6.4.16
(4)	*cī +*	*cī + sa*				P. 6.1.9
(5)	*ci +*	*cī + sa*				P. 7.4.59
(6)	*ci +*	*cī + sa*			*+ lAṬ*	P. 3.2.124
(7)	*ci +*	*cī + sa*			*+ tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(8)	*ci +*	*cī + sa*	*+ ŚaP*		*+ ti*	P. 3.1.68
(9)	*ci +*	*cī +*		*sa*	*+ ti*	P. 6.1.97
(10)	*ci +*	*cī +*		*ṣa*	*+ ti*	P. 8.3.59
	cicīṣati.					

The argument involved in both opinions can only become clear from the discussion of the *Vts*. See further under 6.

5. We note that there is no *Nyāsa* commentary on the rule, which is rather strange seeing the difficulties involved in the commentary by the *KV*. On the other hand, we have a rather extensive *Padamañjarī* commentary.

6. We have three *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that in the stage *anaḍuh + sU* there is a chance that *āM* will be prohibited, because the *nUM*-rule is *anavakāśa* 'left without scope (of application elsewhere).' Being *anavakāśa*, *nUM* will block the augment *āM*.

Why *anavakāśa*? Out of the two rules concerned, P. 7.1.89 is applicable before the five *sarvanāmasthāna* endings. On the other hand, P. 7.1.82 is applicable before the sg. nom. ending *sU* only. Therefore the latter rule will prevail. Compare *AP* IV, p. 8-9.

Vt. II says, or rather, (the difficulty does) not (arise), because *nUM* has been prescribed after an *aṅga* whose prefinal (vowel) is *a*. Patañjali explains that *āt* is continued from P. 7.1.80. Therefore P. 7.1.82 is interpreted to mean that *nUM* is inserted after *a / ā* of *anaḍuh*. The idea is that the insertion of *am / ām* feeds the

insertion of *nUM*. The question of a *bādhyabādhakabhāva* between the augments does not arise at all.

Vt. III, part i, proposes an alternative. We can manage by understanding *punaḥprasaṅga* 're-applicability (of a superseded rule).' Reference is to what has become *PN*, *pbh.* 39. Compare P. 7.1.50, under 3. In our case, this amounts to saying that after applying the special rule P. 7.1.82, we can still apply the general (*āM*-) rule P. 7.1.98. The corresponding *prakriyā* of *anaḍvān* then is as follows :

(2)	*anaḍuh* + °	P. 6.1.68
(3)	*anaḍu-nUM-h*	P. 7.1.82
(4)	*anaḍuānh*	P. 7.1.98
	etc. See under 3, above.	

Vt. III, part ii, provides analogous cases of joint application. It says that after the *āT*-substitution (by P. 6.1.45), etc. reduplication takes place. Patañjali quotes the examples *jagle* 'he has become tired,' *mamle* 'he has become weak,' *ījatuḥ* 'the two of them have sacrificed' and *ījuḥ* 'they have sacrificed.'

The *prakriyā* of *jagle* is as follows :

(1)	*glai-*	*Dhp.* 1.952
(2)	*glai* + *lIṬ*	P. 3.2.115

At this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously, P. 6.1.16 for the *ā*-substitution and P. 6.1.8 for reduplication. The substitution rule which applies to the *upadeśa* stage of the verbal base is the special rule, and must, therefore, prevail.

(3)	*glā-* + *lIṬ*	P. 6.1.45
(4)	*glā* + *glā* + *lIṬ*	P. 6.1.108
(5)	*gla* + *glā* + *lIṬ*	P. 7.4.59
(6)	*ga* + *glā* + *lIṬ*	P. 7.4.60
(7)	*ja* + *glā* + *lIṬ*	P. 7.4.62
(8)	*ja* + *glā* + *ta*	P. 3.4.78
(9)	*ja* + *glā* + *eŚ*	P. 3.4.81
(10)	*ja* + *gl°* + *e*	P. 6.4.64
	jagle.	

In *ījatuḥ* and *ījuḥ*, after *saṃprasāraṇa* has been applied by P. 6.1.16, reduplication takes place by P. 6.1.8. The rest of Patañjali's argument adds nothing new to the discussion.

7.1.83 DṚK-SVAVAS-SVATAVASĀṂ CHANDASI 'in the Vedic language (*nUM* becomes part) of (the nominal base *aṅgas*) *dṛś* "looking (like)," *svavas* "affording good protection" and *svatavas* "self-strong," (if *sU* follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a peculiarity regarding *nUM* in the Vedic language.

2. The *uddeśya* is *chandasi dṛksvavassvatasām* (*aṅgānāṃ sau*). For *chandas* see *ATA*, n. 131. *Dṛksvavassvatavasām* is an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. It discontinues *anaḍuhaḥ* from P. 7.1.82. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sau* is continued from P. 7.1.82. The *vidheya* is *nUM*, continued from P. 7.1.80. For the character of Vedic rules see *AP* IX, p. 172-173, and P. 7.1.56, under 2.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *īdṛṅ* 'a such-like one,' *tādṛṅ* 'a such like one,' *yādṛṅ* 'of such quality as,' *sadṛṅ* 'one similar to,' *svavān* 'one affording good protection' and *svatavān pāyur agne* 'o Agni, (your) anus is self-strong' (source unknown). The first four examples are sg. nom. forms. The last example is a sg. voc. one.

As explained by the *Nyāsa*, *dṛś* is itself a *KviN*-derrivation by P. 3.2.60. The *prakriyā* of *īdṛṅ* is as follows :

(1)	(((*idam* + *am*) + *dṛś*)) + *KviN*))) + *sU*	P. 3.2.60; 4.1.2
(2)	(((*idam* + °) + *dṛś*)) + *vi*))) + *s*	P. 2..4.72
(3)	(((*idam* + *dṛś*)) + °))) + *s*	P. 6.1.67
(4)	(*īŚ* + *dṛś*) + *s*	P. 6.3.90; 1.1.62
(5)	*īdṛś* + °	P. 6.1.68
(6)	*īdṛ-nUM-ś*	P. 7.1.83; 1.1.62
(7)	*īdṛn*°	P. 8.2.23
(8)	*īdṛṅ*	P. 8.2.62
	īdṛn.	

For *dṛś* compare Whitney, § 386, under 3.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

5. The present rule closes the sub-section dealing with *nUM*.

7.1.84 DIVA AUT '*auT* (comes) in place of (the final of the nominal base *aṅga*) *div* "sky," (if *sU* follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substition of *au* for the *v* of *div*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*aṅgasya*) *divaḥ* (*sau*). Here *aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Divaḥ* is a technical genitive by P. 1 1.49. According to P. 1.1.52, a substitute replaces the final of the original form. *Divaḥ* discontinues *dṛk...svatavasām* from P. 7.1.83. *Sau* is continued from P. 7.1.82. The *vidheya* is *auT*. According to the *Nyāsa*, the *T* is added to facilitate pronunciation. *AuT* discontinues *nUM* from P. 7.1.80.

3. The example quoted by the *KV* is *dyauḥ* 'the sky.' The *prakriyā* is as follows :

(1)	*div* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*diau* + *s*	P. 7.1.84
(3)	*dyau* + *s*	P. 6.1.77
(4)	*dyau* + *rU*	P. 8.2.66
(5)	*dyau* + *ḥ*	P. 8.3.15
	dyauḥ.	

4. Referring to *Vt*. III on the rule, the *KV* says that the *div* mentioned in the rule is a *prātipadika* 'nominal stem' without *anubandha*. The verbal base *div-*, on the other hand, is provided with an *anubandha*. In fact, it is quoted as *divU*, *Dhp*. 4.1. Therefore the rule does not apply in *akṣadyūḥ* 'one who plays dice.' The example is borrowed from Patañjali (*bhāṣya* on *Vt*. I). The *prakriyā* is as follows :

(1)	(((*akṣa* + *am*) + *div*)) + *KviP*))) + *sU*	P. 3.2.76; 4.2.1
(2)	(((*akṣa* + °) + *div*)) + *vi*))) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(((*akṣa* + *div*)) + °))) + *s*	P. 6.1.67
(4)	*akṣadi-ūṬH* + *s*	P. 6.4.19
(5)	*akṣadyū* + *s*	P. 6.1.77
(6)	*akṣadyū* + *ḥ*	P. 8.2.66; 8.3.15
	akṣadyūḥ.	

5. We have three *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that, *given* the *auT*-substitution of *div*, there is a prohibition of the same substitution in the case of the verbal base *div-* 'to play dice.'

In stage (4) of the *prakriyā* shown under 4, *yaṆ-ādeśa* has been applied. Still, °*dyū* is not considered different from *div-* by *PN, pbh.* 37, which says that a form which has undergone a change in one part is nevertheless treated like the original. Thereby *dyū* is treated like *div.* As a result, P. 7.1.84 becomes applicable, which is not desired. Therefore *Vt.* I says that a prohibition should be stated. Now, even if *KviP* is added by P. 3.2.76, *div*, that is, *dyū*, retains its status of *dhātu* by the maxim *kvibantaṃ dhātutvaṃ na jahāti* 'a form ending in *KviP* does not lose its status of verbal base.' See P. 7.1.70, under 7.

Patañjali then quotes the first half of *Vt* II. It mentions the possibility to manage by continuing *adhātoḥ* '(of an *aṅga*) which is not a verbal base' from P. 7.1.70, by *maṇḍūkapluti*. Consequently, P. 7.1.84 is not to be applied in derivations like *aksadyūḥ*.

Vt II is an *iti ced Vt*. See *BDA*, n. 633. It says that, if we think that we can manage by continuing the word *adhātoḥ* from P. 7.1.70, then we have a difficulty in neuter (pl.) forms. Patañjali quotes the examples *kāsthataṅkṣi* '(those carpenter families; the word supplied is *kulāni*) who fashion wood' and *kūṭataṅkṣi* '(those carpenter families) who have a workshop (*kūṭa*) of their own.' Compare Agrawala ²1963, p. 230. It may be remembered that, at least in the times of the ṚgV., carpentry was the prerogative of the *Ṛbhus*. See K.F. Geldner, *Der Rig-Veda. Erster Teil*, p. 143, on ṚgV. 1.111.

The *prakriyā* of *kāṣṭhataṅkṣi* is as follows :

(1)	(((*kāṣṭha* + *am*) + *takṣ*)) + *KviP*)))	+ *Jas*	P. 3.2.76; 4.1.2
(2)	(((*kāṣṭha* + °) + *takṣ*)) + *vi*)))	+ *as*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	(((*kāṣṭha* + *takṣ*)) + °)))	+ *as*	P. 6.1.67
(4)	*kāṣṭhatakṣ*	+ *Śi*	P. 7.1.20; 1.1.42
(5)	*kāṣṭhata-nUM-kṣ*	+ *i*	P. 7.1.72
(6)	*kāṣṭhataṃkṣ*	+ *i*	P. 8.2.24
(7)	*kāṣṭhataṅkṣ*	+ *i*	P. 8.4.58
	kāṣṭhataṅkṣi.		

According to Whitney, § 384, in comparison with feminines and masculines, the neuters of what he calls root stems are rarest of all. In § 389, c. he notes that, according to the grammarians, neuter stem, except those ending in a nasal or semivowel, take a strengthening nasal before the final consonant in the pl. nom.-acc.-voc. He adds that no such cases from neuter stems appear ever to have been met with in use.

The argument of *Vt.* II is that, if *adhātoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.70 in P. 7.1.84, it will also be continued in P. 7.1.72. In that case, since *takṣ* is not a non-verbal base, consequently, *nUM* cannot be inserted to derive the form *kāṣṭhataṅkṣi*.

Vt. III is an *uktaṃ vā Vt.* See *ATA*, Note (119). It says that a statement has already been made. Reference is to a statement by Patañjali (*Mbh.* III. p. 259, lines 3-4, also made earlier (*Mbh.* I, p. 71, lines 4-5), which has become *PN*, *pbhs*. 81 (and 82). Here a problem arises. How can a *Vt.* refer to a statement by Patañjali? This seems only plausible on the assumption that the statement is only transmitted as made by Patañjali, but, in fact, is quoted by Patañjali, without saying so, from earlier tradition, even from Kātyāyana himself.

The statement says that when a form without *anubandha* is used, it does not refer to the same form provided with an *anubandha*. In the *Dhp.* (4.1) the verbal base *div-* has been mentioned as *divU-*. On the other hand, P. 7.1.84 mentions the form *div* without *anubandha*. The conclusion is that P. 7.1.84 does not refer to the verbal base *div-*.

Patañjali then proposes an alternative. He says that he - reference is to Patañjali himself - will continue a *saṃbandha* 'connection.' That is to say, the item to be continued is a connected statement as a whole, or it consists of a series of individual words connected in a given *sūtra*. Thereby the continuity of a topic which has been interrupted is shown. See *FANU*, p. 10-11. In our case, the *sūtra* concerned is P. 7.1.70, which says *ugidacāṃ sarvanāmasthāne 'dhātoḥ*, and in which *nUM* is continued. Here the word *adhātoḥ* is connected with three words, *ugit*, *sarvanāmasthāna* and *nUM*. These four connected words are continued in the rules between P. 7.1.70-84. They may not be applicable in all of these rules, but they are kept in a state of suspended animation, so to speak, to be used when need arises. In P. 7.1.71-72 the words *sarvanāmasthāna* and *nUM* are needed. In P. 7.1.73 only *nUM* is needed. From P. 7.1.74 till P. 7.1.84 none of the words concerned is needed. But in P. 7.1.84 we require the word *adhātoḥ*, so it is revived. Like *maṇḍūkapluti*, *saṃbandhānuvṛtti* belongs to a commentator's bag of tricks.

7.1.85 PATHI-MATHY-ṚBHUKṢĀM ĀT *'āT* (comes) in place of (the final of the nominal base *aṅgas*) *pathin* "path," *mathin* "churning stick" and *ṛbhukṣin* "name of Indra," (if *sU* follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *ā* for *n* of the three words mentioned, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* (*aṅgānāṃ sau*). Here *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* discontinues *divaḥ* from P. 7.1.84. The stems mentioned actually end in *in*, but, as stated by the *Nyāsa*, in the forms as appearing in the rule P. 6.1.68 and in *-ṛbhukṣām ṭilopa* by P. 7.1.88 are applied. For points of declension see Whitney, §§ 433-434. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sau* is continued from P. 7.1.82.Thus the rule specifically applies, if the case ending *sU* follows. The *vidheya* is *āT*. It discontinues *auT* from P. 7.1.84. Substitution is of the stem-final only, by P. 1.1.52. The function of *T* of *āT* is defined by P. 1.1.70.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *panthāḥ* 'a path,' *manthāḥ* 'a churning stick' and *ṛbhuksāḥ* 'Indra,' all sg. nom. forms. The *prakriyā* of *panthās* is as follows :

(1) *pathin* + *sU* P. 4.1.2

At this stage two rules become applicable simultanously, P. 6.1.68 for deleting the case ending, and P. 7.1.85. The latter rule, which destroys the *nimitta* of the first rule, prevails by the *siddha*-principle. See *AP* I, p. 85 - 90, and *AP* II, Introduction, p. vi-xi.

(2) *pathiā* + *s* P. 7.1.85

At this stage two rules become applicable simultaneously, P. 6.1.77 for *yaN-ādeśa* and P. 7.1.86 for the *a*-substitution of *i*. The latter rule, being the special rule, prevails by the *utsarga-apavāda*-principle. See *AP* IV, p. 19-20.

(3) *pathaā* + *s* P. 7.1.86
(4) *panthaā* + *s* P. 7.1.87
(5) *panthā* + *s* P. 6.1.101
panthās.

4. The *KV* notes that, although the nasal variety of *ā* should be applied as the substitute of *n* by P. 1.1.50, the *ā* is, in fact, non-nasal. The reason stated by the *KV* is that by what has become *PN, pbh.* 19 a sound prescribed by a rule does not include its homogeneous varieties.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.86 ITO 'T SARVANĀMASTHĀNE '*aT* (comes) in place of *iT* (of the nominal base *aṅgas pathin* "path," *mathin* "churning stick" and *ṛbhukṣin* "name of Indra,") if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of short *a* for the *i* of the stems mentioned, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*pathimathyṛbhukṣām aṅgānām*) *itaḥ sarvanāmasthāne*. Here *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* is continued from P. 7.1.85. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Itaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. It refers to the prefinal *i* of the stems mentioned. For *sarvanāmasthāne* see P. 7.1.70, under 2. It discontinues *sau* from P. 7.1.82, but *sU* is included in *sarvanāmasthāne*. The *vidheya* is *aT*. It discontinues *āT* from P. 7.1.85. The *T* has been added to indicate that reference is to short *a* only, by P. 1.1.70.

According to the *Nyāsa* on P. 7.1.98, *sarvanāmasthāne* is marked with *svarita* (P. 1.3.11). It opens a sub-section which ends with P. 7.1.99.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *pathin* :

panthāḥ (sg. nom.), *panthānau* (du. nom.) , *panthānaḥ* (pl. nom.), *panthānam* (sg. acc.), *panthānau* (du. acc.).

(2) For *mathin* :

manthāḥ, manthānau, manthānah, manthānam, manthānau

(3) For *ṛbhukṣin* :

ṛbhukṣāḥ, ṛbhukṣāṇau, ṛbhukṣāṇaḥ, ṛbhukṣāṇam, ṛbhukṣāṇau

In these forms the *ā* is the result of the application of P. 6.1.101 to the substitute sequence *a* + *ā*. The *th* is replaced by *nth*, by P. 7.1.87.

4. Referring to *Vt*. II on the rule, the *KV* says that the prescription of *aT* is for the sake of the form in which *i* is preceded by *ṣ*. The example quoted is the sg. acc. *ṛbhukṣaṇam*. Here we have an option for lengthening by P. 6.4.9. See further under 5.

5. We have two *Vts* on the rule. *Vt*. I says that the prescription of the *aT*-substitution for *iT* is redundant, because the context deals with *ā*. In fact, *āT* has been prescribed as a substitute by P. 7.1.85. Therefore, if *aT* had not been prescribed by P. 7.1.86, *āT* would have continued in this rule. In the *prakriyā* this would not make any difference because in the substitute sequence *a* + *ā* P. 6.1.101 is applied anyway.

Vt. II says that, however, *at* has been stated in P. 7.1.86 for the sake of the form in which *i* is preceded by *ṣ*. Reference is to *ṛbhukṣin*. The example provided by Patañjali is the alternative expression *ṛbhukṣāṇam indram* / *ṛbhukṣaṇam indram* '(I invoke) Indra, the *ṛbhukṣin*' (ṚgV. 1.111.4).

The argument involved is as follows. P. 6.4.9 prescribes the preferable lengthening of the prefinal vowel which is preceded by *ṣ* of an *anga* ending in *n* before a *sarvanāmasthāna* case ending, when the question is of a statement in Vedic style (*nigame*). Thus, in the case of *ṛbhukṣin*, by P. 6.4.9, before the sg. acc. ending *am* we have two forms, *ṛbhukṣāṇam* (preferred) and *ṛbhukṣaṇam* (not preferred). But if *āT* is continued from P. 7.1.85 in P. 7.1.86, the *prakriyā* will be as follows :

(1) *ṛbhukṣin* + *am*	P. 4.1.2
(2) *ṛbhukṣān* + *am*	P. 7.1.86
(3) *ṛbhukṣāṇ* + *am*	*Vt*. I on P. 8.4.2
ṛbhukṣāṇam.	

This makes the application of lengthening by P. 6.4.9 superfluous. Consequently, we cannot justify the non-preferred optional form *ṛbhukṣaṇam* which is allowed by the same rule. Now, since P. 7.1.86 specifically prescribes *aT*, we can justify the form *ṛbhukṣaṇam*. At the same time, lengthening can be optionally applied by P. 6.4.9. That is how the two forms *ṛbhukṣāṇam* and *rbhukṣaṇam* are taken care of.

7.1.87 THO NTHAḤ '*nth* (comes) in place of *th* (of the nominal base *aṅgas pathin* "path," *mathin* "churning stick" and *ṛbhukṣin* "name of Indra," if a *sarvanāmasthāma* ending follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *nth* for *th* of the stems mentioned, on the condition stated. Obviously, the rule applies to *pathin* and *mathin* only.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*pathimathyṛbhukṣām aṅgānām*) *thaḥ* (*sarvanāmasthāne*). Here *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* is continued from P. 7.1.85. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Thaḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. *Sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.86. The *vidheya* is *nthaḥ*. It discontinues *aT* from P. 7.1.86.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *pathin :*

panthāḥ, panthānau, panthānaḥ

(2) For *mathin* :

manthāḥ, manthānau, manthānaḥ

For explanation and *prakriyā* see P. 7.1.85, under 3, and P. 7.1.86, under 3.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.88 BHASYA ṬER LOPAḤ '*lopa*-deletion (comes) in place of (the) *ṭi*(-portion) of the *bha* stem (of the nominal base *aṅgas pathin* "path," *mathin* "churning stick" and *ṛbhukṣin* "name of Indra")'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing *lopa*-substitution of the *ṭi*-portion of the stems mentioned when called *bha*.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*pathimathyṛbhukṣām aṅgānām*) *bhasya ṭeḥ*. Here *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* is continued from P. 7.1.85. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Bha* is the designation given to a nominal stem by P. 1.4.18, when a case ending which begins with a vowel or with the semi-vowel *y* follows. *Ṭi* is defined by P. 1.1.64 as that portion of a linguistic item which begins with the last among its vowel. *Bhasya ṭeh* discontinues *thaḥ* from P. 7.1.87. In the present rule the term *sarvanāmasthāne* from P. 7.1.86 cannot be continued,. because in the *bha*-rule P. 1.4.18 the condition *asarvanāsthāne* is continued. See *AP* IV, p.69. Therefore P. 7.1.88 is best considered to be an associative digression, for which see *FANU*, p. 197. After the discontinuation of *sarvanāmasthne* in the present rule it is continued again in P. 7.1.89.

The *vidheya* is *lopaḥ*, defined by P. 1.1.60. A *lopa*-rule, being an environment changing rule, prevails in the case of conflict. See *AP* IX, p. 296. *Lopaḥ* discontinues *nthaḥ* from P. 7.1.87.

3. The examples provided (pl. acc., sg. instr. and sg. dat.) by the *KV* are

(1) For *pathin* :

pathaḥ, pathā, pathe

(2) For *mathin* :

mathaḥ, mathā, mathe

(3) For *ṛbhukṣin* :

ṛbhukṣaḥ, ṛbhukṣā, ṛbhukṣe .

No examples are quoted for the du. gen. / loc. ending *-os*. In all forms quoted the stem receives the designation *bha* before a case ending which begins with a vowel. The *ṭi*-portion of this *bha* stem, namely, *in*, is deleted.

4. The *KV* notes that, although *sarvanāmasthāne* is continued (from P. 7.1.86, as shown in P. 7.1.89), it is not connected with the present rule, because that would involve a contradiction. As explained by the *Nyāsa*, the contradiction consists in this that, on the one hand, if the endings are *sarvanāmasthāna*, the designation *bha* cannot be applied, and that, on the other hand, if the designation *bha* is applied, the endings cannot be *sarvanāmasthāna*.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.89 PUṂSO 'SUṄ '*asUṄ* (comes) in place of (the final of the nominal base *aṅga*) *puṃs* "man," (if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *asUṄ* for the final of *pums*, on the condition stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *puṃsaḥ* (*aṅgasya sarvanāmasthāne*). Here *puṃsaḥ* discontinues *pathimathyṛbhukṣām*. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmasthāne*

is continued from P. 7.1.86. See P. 7.1.88, under 2. It discontinues *bhasya ṭeḥ* from P. 7.1.88. The *vidheya* is *asUṄ*. It discontinues *lopaḥ* from P. 7.1.88.

3. The examples provided by the *KV* are *pumān* (sg. nom.), *pumāṃsau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *pumāṃsaḥ* (pl. nom.). For the declension of the uncompounded stem see Whitney, § 394. For the compounded stem see Whitney, § 394 b.

The *prakriyā* of *pumān* is as follows:

(1) *puṃs*	+ *s*	P. 4.1.2

At this stage two rules apply simultaneously, P. 6.1.68 for deletion of the case ending, and P. 7.1.89 for the substitution of *asUṄ*. By the *siddha*-principle P. 6.1.68, which destroys the *nimitta* of P. 7.1.89, prevails. After the *lopa*-deletion of the case ending we can still have the desired effect of the case ending by P. 1.1.62.

(2) *puṃs*	+ °	P. 6.1.68
(2) *pumasUṄ*	+ °	P. 7.1.89; 1.1.62
(3) *puma-nUM-s*	+ °	P. 7.1.70 (*asUN* is *ugit*)
(4) *pumāns*		P. 6.4.19
(5) *pumān°*		P. 8.2.23
pumān.		

As stated by the *KV*, the accent of *pumān* is *ādyudātta*. The reason is that the substitute which replaces a consonant is always *anudātta*. Consonants have no accent. A check of ṚgVedic passages (4.3.10; 5.69.5; 3.29.13; 6.75.14; 7104.24) in which the words *pumān* and *pumāṃsam* are used reveals that the accent is invariably on the syllable *pu*. Therefore T. Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language*. Faber and Faber : London 1955, p. 227, wrongly puts the accent on the syllable *mā*.

4. Referring to *Vt*. I on the rule, the *KV* says that in *paramapumān* 'the supreme man' (reference is to Vishnu) the *antodātta* accent has already been applied before the sg. nom. case ending *sU* is added. (But) once the case ending has been added (which conditions the addition of *asUṄ*), there is a chance for an undesired accent in (the form ending in) *asUṄ*. To prevent that, a statement of *upadeśivad*(*bhāva*) with regard to (the form ending in) *asUṄ* must be made. Thereby *paramapumān* becomes *antodātta*. But the word *pumān* (itself) is *ādyudātta*. What the *KV* means can only become clear from the discussion on *Vt*. I on the rule. See further under 5, below.

5. We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It says that with regard to P. 7.1.89 a statement of treatment like the *upadeśin* 'form as quoted in the *upadeśa*' should be made to justify the accent, because (*asUṄ*) is conditioned by (a) *bahiraṅga* (element). For *upadeśa* see *AP* IX, p. 118-122. The *bahiraṅga* element referred to is the sg. nom. case ending *sU*. The example quoted by Patañjali is the cp. *paramapumān* 'the supreme man.' As explained by the *Nyāsa*, it is a *tp.* cp. by P. 2.1.61. By the general accent rule for cps, P. 6.1.223, the accent of the sg. nom. *paramapumān* should be *antodātta*, that is, the accent should be on the syllable *mā*. There is, however, an undesired possibility for the accent to be on the syllable *pu*. The question is, how to prevent that.

The *prakriyā* of *paramapumān* is as follows:

(1)	((*parama* + *sU*) + (*puṃs* + *sU*)) + *sU*	P. 2.1.61; 1.2.46; 4.1.2
(2)	((*parama* + °) + (*puṃs* + °)) + *s*	P. 2.4.71
(3)	*paramapuṃs* + °	P. 6.1.68

At this stage two rules become applicable, P. 6.1.223 for accentuation, and P. 7.1.89 for the substitution of *asUṄ*, as conditioned by the case ending *sU*. Here P. 6.1.223 is considered to be *antaraṅga* 'not requiring an outside cause,' whereas P. 7.1.89 is considered to be *bahiraṅga* 'requiring an outside cause.' The outside cause is the case ending *sU*. 'Outside' here means outside the *prātipadika* *paramapuṃs*. P. 6.1.223, being *antaraṅga*, prevails.

(4)	*paramapúṃs*	P. 6.1.223
(5)	*paramapúmas*	P. 7.1.89

A substitute which replaces a consonant is always *anudātta*.

(6)	*paramapúma-nUM-s*	P. 7.1.70
(7)	*paramapúmāns*	P. 6.4.10
(8)	*paramapúmān°*	P. 8.2.23
	paramapúmān.	

The form derived is not desired. What we want is the *antodātta* form *paramapumān*. How to establish that?

The answer stated by *Vt.* I is *upadeśivadbhāva* 'treatment like a form quoted in the *upadeśa*.' The idea is that *asUṄ* has already been added in the *upadeśa* stage, before the conditioning element *sU* has been added. In other words, the original

form is considered to be *pumas*, and not *puṃs*. Afterwards, in the cp. *paramapumān* the *antodātta* required by the general rule P. 6.1.223 is applied.

For the example quoted we are dependent on Patañjali. *Vt.* I does not say *samāse* 'in cp.-formation.' But we note that the *Vt.* makes good sense when referring to a cp.

6. Theoretically, accent rules are applied taking into consideration the word form as a sequence of linguistic elements. Here the accent of the element which appears last in the sequence prevails. *Vt.* IX on P. 6.1.158 says *satiśiṣṭasvarasya balīyastvam anyatra vikaraṇebhyaḥ* 'prevalence of the *satiśiṣṭa* accent, except (in the case of the accent of) *vikaraṇas*.' That is to say, the high pitch (*udātta*) of the element which appears last prevails over all other *udāttas*, and is, therefore, retained. The accent of *vikaraṇas* does not prevail. For instance, in *cinutê* 'he piles up' the *udātta* accent of the finite verb ending which comes last in the order of sequence of elements prevails. See *SA*, n. 490.

To establish the correct accentuation, tradition usually phrases *ad hoc* rules, like *anyatra vikaraṇebhyaḥ* or *upadeśivadvacanam*. They are not really required. We can manage by the *satiśiṣṭa* rule.

7.1.90 GOTO ṆIT '(a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending following) immediately after (the nominal base *aṅga*) *go* "cow; bull," (is treated like being) *Ṇit* "marked with *Ṇ*"'

1. In the translation stated two questions have been answered immediately. First, in *gotah* the *t* represents the *anubandha T*, so that the rule applies only when *go* actually appears as *go*, and, secondly, the item for which *Ṇittva* is prescribed is a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending. Regarding the second question tradition offers four answers for which see under 3.

2. P. 7.1.90 is an *atideśasūtra* 'rule of treatment (of y) like (x).' For *atideśa* see *ATA*, p. 3, n. 1. What is meant by *atideśa* in grammar is not a transference of properties from x to y, like in Mīmāṃsā, but a treatment of y, which is not x, like x. Thus the present rule is interpreted to mean that after *go sarvanāmasthāna* endings, which actually are not *Ṇit*, are treated like *Ṇit*. They are treated like *Ṇit* in order to cause *vṛddhi* of the vowel of *go* by P. 7.2.115. As noted by Patañjali (*Mbh.* III, p. 272, lines 6-8), in the present rule the suffix *vat*, indicative of *atideśa*, is not used. To justify the non-use of *°vat*, Patañjali quotes an example from daily life. For an example from grammar see P. 1.2.1. Thus *Ṇit* may be taken to stand for *Ṇidvat* '(treated) like *Ṇit*.'

3. By way of answer to the second question the *Nyāsa* enumerates four possible interpretations of the rule :

(1) *gotaḥ paraṃ sarvanāmasthānaṃ Ṇid bhavati* 'a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending following after *go* becomes *Ṇit*.' That is to say, it receives the designation *Ṇit*. Here the sg. loc. *sarvanāmasthāne* is changed into the sg. nom. *sarvanāmasthānam*. But in this way, P. 7.1.90 becomes an *itsaṃjñāsūtra*. Consequently, wherever the word *Ṇit* is mentioned, we have to supply *sarvanāmasthāna* as the *saṃjñin*. This view is obviously wrong and can be dismissed out of hand.

(2) *gotaḥ parasya sarvanāmasthānasya Ṇakāra itsaṃjñāko bhāvyate* 'in connection with a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending following after *go* (the *it*-marker) *Ṇ* is brought into existence.' Here the sg. loc. *sarvanāmasthāne* is changed into a genitive, and the genitive is taken to convey the general gen. sense of *saṃbandha* (P. 2.3.59). Accorddingly, this interpretation may be called the *saṃbandhapratipādana*-view 'view in which relation in general is conveyed.' The relation is between the *anubandha Ṇ* and *sarvanāmasthāna*. Which relation? A relation of *sāmīpya* 'nearness,' in the sense that wherever a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending occurs the *it*-letter *Ṇ* is near. This view cannot be maintained, because in the A. a gen. ending conveys either *sthānyādeśabhāva* (P. 1.1.49), or *avayavāyavībhāva* 'a part-whole relation,' but never *sāmīpya*.

(3) *gotaḥ (sarvanāmasthānasya) Ṇid bhavati, Ṇidvad bhavatītyarthaḥ* 'after *go*, in place of a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending *Ṇit* comes (as a substitute).' Here the sg. loc. *sarvanāmasthāne* is changed into a genitive, and the genitive is taken to convey the technical sense of *sthāne* by P. 1.1.49. This interpretation, which has been mentioned by Patañjali in his introductory *bhāṣya* to *Vt*. I on the rule, may be called the *ādeśavidhāna*-view 'view which prescribes substitution.' It can be discarded immediately.. It makes no sense to substitute *Ṇit* for a *sarvanānasthāma* ending.

(4) *gotaḥ (sarvanāmasthānam) Ṇid bhavati, Ṇidvad bhavatītyarthaḥ* 'after *go* a *sarvanāmasthāna*) ending becomes *Ṇit*, that is to say, it is treated like *Ṇit*.' This is the *atideśa*-view, which is finally accepted. Although the suffix *vatI* is not mentioned, its sense is understood, like in P. 1.2.1. This is the interpretation accepted by the *KV*, and by us. See *FANU*, p. 226-227. We note that when a *vidheya* is stated in the nom., the corresponding *uddeśya* item must occur in the nom. also. See, for instance, P. 1.2.4, *sārvadhātukam aPit*; P. 1.2.5, *asaṃyogāl lIṬ*; P. 3.4.103, *yāsUṬ...Ṅit..*; P. 3.4.104, *(lIṄ) Kit*.

4. The *uddeśya* (according to the interpretation of the rule accepted by us) is *gotaḥ* (*aṅgāt sarvanāmasthānam*). *Gotaḥ* discontinues *puṃsaḥ* from P. 7.1.89. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.86. The *vidheya* is *Ṇit*. According to P. 7.2.115-116, a *Ṇit* suffix causes *vṛddhi* of the vowel in final or penultimate position of an *aṅga*.

5. The form *gotaḥ* presents a difficulty. One might consider that it is a *tasI* - formation by P. 5.4.45 with the value of a technical abl. But this is rendered improbable because in other *Pāṇinisūtras* the sg. abl. of *go* is *goḥ* (P. 4.3.145; 7.1.57). The only Pāṇinian alternative is to refer to P. 1.1.70. By this rule the *T* serves to restrict an *aṆ*-vowel to the duration stated. But in the present case, according to a tradition already referred to by *Vt*. III on the present rule, the *anubandha T* in *gotaḥ* has been added to restrict the application of the rule to the stem *go* only. Thereby the *Ṇit*-operation is prevented, first, in forms like *citraguḥ* 'one possessing brindled cows' and *śabalaguh* 'one possessing mottled cows,' and , secondly, in the sg. voc. of these form, like *he citrago*, because here °*go* is the result of a rule application (P. 7.3.108). The examples are borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh*. III, p. 272, line 12). See further under 8 and 10, below.

6. P. 7.1.90 opens a small section dealing with *Ṇittva* ending with P. 7.1.92. The section comes in a context of rules which deal with substitution (P. 7.1.84-89; 93-94). The place of the rules P.7.1.90-92 is, therefore. questionable. They should have come either immediately before or after P. 7.1.95-97, which also deal with *atideśa*.

7. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *gauḥ* (sg. nom.), *gāvau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *gāvaḥ*. In the last two examples P. 6.1.78 is applied. In the sg. and pl. acc. the *o* of *go* is replaced by *ā* by the special rule P. 6.1.93.

In *Candragomin*, Part II, p.238-239, the *goto ṇit* rule is phrased as *gor auḥ svārthe* 'au (comes) in place of (the final of) *go* (before *suṬ*), provided that the (stem's) own meaning is conveyed.' The significance of the condition *svārthe* is shown by the counterexample *citragu*, a *bv*. cp. which conveys *anyapadārtha*.

8. How to justify the sg. voc. forms (*he*) *citrago* 'o owner of brindled cows' and (*he*) *śabalago* 'o owner of mottled cows.' This the *KV* does by invoking what has become *PN*, *pbh*. 92. It says *aṅgavṛtte punar vṛttāv avidhiḥ* 'once an *aṅga*-operation has taken place (and) if again an (*aṅga*-)operation (becomes applicable, the latter) operation is not (allowed).' Therefore, after *guṇa* has been applied by P. 7.3.108, the *Ṇit*-operation by P. 7.2.115 is not allowed. The answer is not

convincing, because *aṅga*-operations are many times applied in succession to one and the same form. The *pbh.* referred to is not always valid. Reference should be to *PN, pbh.* 105, *lakṣaṇa-pratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam* 'when (a word is used which) may be taken to stand for (both) a form derived by a rule and a particular (non-derived, original) wordform, it should be taken to stand for the latter only.'

9. Why not interpret *gotaḥ* in P. 7.1.90 as a *saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive case ending denoting relation in general' in the sense of a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending connected with *go*? This is the next question raised by the *KV*. The rule is then interpreted to say that any *sarvanāmasthāna* ending, sg., etc., when added after *go*, is called the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending of *go*. This also absolves us of the difficulty in justifying the form *citraguḥ*, because that refers to the sg. of an *anyapadārtha*, namely, the owner of the cow, and not of *go*.

10. Finally, the *KV* records the opinion of some grammarians (*kecit*; compare P. 7.1.30, under 5, and P. 7.1.80, under 4). The opinion has not been mentioned in the *bhāṣya* on the present rule. The grammarians referred to read P. 7.1.90 as *oto ṇit*, so that the rule becomes applicable to the stem *dyo* 'sky' also. The *KV* quotes the examples *dyauḥ* (sg. nom.), *dyāvau* 'heaven and earth,' an elliptic dual, and *dyāvaḥ* (pl. nom.). Compare Whitney, § 360 d. But that opinion is rejected by saying that the word *gotaḥ* itself, on account of the mention of the *anubandha T*, must be regarded as an *upalakṣaṇa* 'a mere general indication' of a form ending in *o*. In other words, *gotaḥ* stands for all words ending in *o*.

Purely from the Pāṇinian point of view, the reading *oto ṇit* is the better one. It justifies the application of *taparakaraṇa* by P. 1.1.70, and it includes all stems ending in *o*, like *dyo*, for which otherwise no provision is made. Could it also be the original reading of P. 7.1.90? If so, then we have to explain how the reading *goto ṇit* has come into existence. For a possible explanation we take our stand in the *saṃhitāpāṭha*, in which P. 7.1.89 and 7.1.90 are read as ...*asuṅṅotoṇit* (doubling of *n* by P. 8.2.32). Here the mispronunciation *asuṅgotoṇit* may easily arise. Alternatively, we may assume that P. 7.1.90 comes from a pre-pāṇininan grammatical source in which the addition of the *anubandha T* has not been restricted to vowels only.

11. We have four *Vts* on the rule. Introducing *Vt* I Patañjali raises the question of interpretation of the rule. Do we interpret it as saying that *Ṇit* comes in place of a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending after *go*, or do we say that, if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows, the *Ṇit*-operation, that is, *vṛddhi*, is to be extended?

Vt. I says that transference of the *Ṇit*-operation should take place, provided that a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately after *go*. The *Vt.* clearly accepts the *atideśa*-view.

Vt. II states the reason for *Vt.* I. Because, if the rule states *Ṇittva,* if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately, (then) we cannot understand what the rule means, because there is no mention of a genitive case ending. *Ṇittva* of what? Patañjali explains that, given the absence of a genitive word identifying the item to which *Ṇittva* is to be applied (namely, *sarvanāsthānasya*), we better take P. 7.1.90 as a prescription of *atideśa*. Thereby *Ṇittva* is transferred to the stem *go* itself. Consequently, *vṛddhi* by P. 7.2.115 can be applied. A prescription of *atideśa* usually contains the suffix °*vat*. This suffix is lacking in the present rule. Patañjali then quotes an example from daily usage where the suffix is also lacking, and where we still understand the sense of *vat*.

In his introductory *bhāṣya* to *Vt.* III Patañjali quotes the examples *citraguḥ* and *śabalaguḥ*. He refers to the traditional view that the *t* in *gotaḥ* is the *anubandha* *T* defined by P. 1.1.70, and that it restricts the mention of *go* to *go* only. But that is not enough to prevent the application of P. 7.1.90 in the two forms, because °*gu* will be treated like *go* by *sthānivadbhāva*. How to prevent *sthānivadbhāva* here?

Vt. III says that the addition of the *anubandha T* in *gotaḥ* is redundant, because of the prohibition of *sthānivadbhāva*. Reference is to *Vt.* XXIX on P. 1.1.56. See *STHĀNI*, Pt. I, p. 133-134, and n. 503. The *Vt.* says that *sthānivadbhāva* of *go* is prohibited in connection with *Ṇittva*. Therefore *gu* cannot be treated as *go*.

Vt. IV states the reason for *Vt.* III. The reason is that otherwise, that is, even if *T* is mentioned, we would need a prohibition of *Ṇittva* in connection with *go* in the sg. voc. and the pl. nom. of *citragu* and *śabalagu*. The derivation of the sg. voc. of *citragu* is as follows :

(1)	(*he*) *citragu* + *sU*	P. 1.2.48; 4.1.2
(2)	*citrago* + *s*	P. 7.3.108
(3)	*citrago* + °	P. 6.1.69
	citrago.	

The derivation of the pl. nom. form is as follows :

(1)	*citragu* + *Jas*	P. 1.2.48; 4.1.2
(2)	*citrago* + *as*	P. 7.3.109

(3) *citragav* + *as* P. 6.1.78
citragavas.

Here, in stage 2 of the derivation, P. 7.1.90 becomes applicable, because the forms concerned end in *o*. Since the case endings *sU* and *Jas* are *sarvanāmasthāna* endings, *Ṇittva* would result in *vṛddhi* of the final stem vowel by P. 7.2.115. This is not desired. It is prevented by the prohibition of *sthānivadbhāva* for *go* in connection with *Ṇittva* by *Vt.* XXIX on P. 1.1.56.

7.1.91 ṆAL UTTAMO VĀ 'the first person sg. ending *ṆaL* (of a verbal base *aṅga* is) preferably (treated like *Ṇit*)'

1. This is an *atideśasūtra* prescribing *Ṇittva* as the preferred option for the pf. first sg. *parasmaipada* ending.

2. The *uddeśya* is *(aṅgasya) ṆaL uttamaḥ*. Here *aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Gotaḥ* from P. 7.1.90 is discontinued on the ground of *sāmarthya*, and so is *sarvanāmasthāne* from P. 7.1.86, at least for the time being, because it is continued again in the next rule. *ṆaL* is a substitute of the *lakāra lIṬ* for the *parasmaipada* sg. first or third person by P. 3.4.82. *Uttamah* is the term used for the first peron by P. 1.4.101. The *vidheya* is *Ṇit vā*. Here *Ṇit*, that is, *Ṇidvat* '(treated) like *Ṇit*' is continued from P. 7.1.90. For *vā* see Kiparsky 1979, p. 1, and for the rule as a whole, p. 142-143. He refers to Whitney, § 793 c. and d., where Whitney says that medial *a* is lengthened optionally in the first person, and that, with a few exceptions like *cakāra* and *jagrāha*, in the earlier language the non-*vṛddhi* form is almost exclusively used for the first person. Kiparsky also notes that by Pāṇinian prescription the pf. tense is limited to events not witnesed by the speaker. As a result, there is practically no way to use the pf. first person.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *ahaṃ cakāra / cakara* 'I have done' and *ahaṃ papāca / papaca* 'I have cooked.' The *Nyāsa* points out that in *cakāra / cakara vṛddhi* due to *Ṇittva* is applied by P. 7.2.115, and *guna* by P. 7.3.84. In *papāca / papaca vṛddhi* due to *Ṇittva* is by P. 7.2.116. The preferred forms are the *vṛddhi* forms.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.92 SAKHYUR ASAṂBUDHAU '(if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending,) except the sg. voc., follows immediately after (the nominal base *aṅga*) *sakhi* "friend" (it is treated like *Ṇit*)'

1. This is an *atideśasūtra* prescribing *Ṇittva* for *sarvanāmasthāna* endings, ex-cept the sg. voc., after *sakhi*.

2. The *uddeśya* is *sakhyuḥ* (*aṅgāt sarvanāmasthāne*) *asaṃbhuddhau*. Here *sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.86. *Aṅgāt* is continued (with *vibhakti-vipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Saṃbuddhi* is the designation of the sg. voc. by P. 2.3.49. The *vidheya* is *Ṇit*, continued from P. 7.1.91.

We note that the *KV* does not continue *vā* in the present rule, and quotes examples for the *vṛddhi* forms only. This goes against *FANU*, p. 272, convention 24, which says that option words are continued in the following rule or rules, as long as the same *vidheya* continues. But the forms **sakhi* (sg. nom.), **sakhayau* (du. nom. / acc.) and **sakhayaḥ* (pl. nom.) are not attested.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *sakhāyau* (du. nom. / acc.) and *sakhāyaḥ* (pl. nom.). For the declension of *sakhi* see Whitney, § 343 a.

4. To point out the significance if the exception *asambuddhau*, the *KV* quotes the counterexample (*he*) *sakhe* 'o friend.' The *Nyāsa* points out that *guṇa* is applied by P. 7.3.108.

5. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

6. The present rule closes the sub-section dealing with *Ṇittva*.

7.1.93 ANAṄ SAU '*anAṄ* (comes in place of the final phoneme of the nominal base *aṅga sakhi* "friend," if (the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending) *sU* follows immediately, (except the sg. voc.)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescrbing the substitution of *anAṄ* for the final of *sakhi*, on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*sakhyuḥ aṅgasya asaṃbuddhau*) *sau*. Here *sakhyuḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.92. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Asaṃbuddhau* is continued from P. 7.1.92. The point is that *sU* is also the case ending of the sg. voc. by P. 2.3.49. But the *sU* meant by the present rule is the sg. nom. case ending

only. *Sau* is a technical loc. by P. 1.1.66. The word *sarvanāmasthāne* from P. 7.1.86 may be continued, because *sU* is a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending. The *vidheya* is *anAṄ*. It discontinues *Ṇit* from P. 7.1.90. The *anubandha* *Ṅ* has been added to show that substitution is of the final of the *aṅga* only, by P. 1.1.53. The option word *vā* from P. 7.1.91 is discontinued because of the change of the *vidheya*. See *FANU*, p. 272, convention 24.

3. Since P. 7.1.92 and 93 are jointly / conjunctively applied in one and the same derivation, the latter rule is considered to be an associative digression of the first rule. Items belonging to an associative digression are not continued in the next rule. See *FANU*, p. 198. On p. 197 the conditions for a rule to be regarded as an associative digression are summed up.

4. The example quoted by the *KV* is *sakhā*. The derivation is as follows :

(1)	*sakhi* + *sU*	P. 4.1.2
(2)	*sakhan* + s	P. 7.1.93
(3)	*sakhan* + °	P. 6.1.68
(4)	*sakhān* + °	P. 6.4.8; 1.1.62
(5)	*sakhā*°	P. 8.2.7
	sakhā.	

For the order of rule application in stage (3) compare P. 7.1.89, under 3 (*puṃsān*).

5. To point out the significance of the continued word *asaṃbuddhau*, the *KV* quotes the sg. voc. (*he*) *sakhe* 'o friend' as the counterexample. *Guṇa* of the final vowel is by P. 7.3.108.

6. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.94 ṚD-UŚANAS-PURUDAṂŚAS-ANEHASĀM CA 'also (*anAṄ* comes in place of the nominal base *aṅgas* ending in short *ṛ*, *uśanas* "name of of Vedic sage", *purudaṃśas* "abounding in mighty deeds" and *anehas* "without a rival," (if the *sarvanāmasthāna* ending *sU* follows immediately, except the sg. voc.)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of *anAṄ* for the final of the *aṅgas* mentioned, on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ṛduśanaspurudaṃśasanehasām* (*aṅgānāṃ sarvanāmasthāne sau asaṃbuddhau*). *Ṛduśanas...anehasām* discontinues *sakhyuḥ* from P. 7.1.92. In *ṛT* the *anubandha T* has been added by P. 1.1.70, to restrict the *anAṄ*-substitution to short *ṛ* only. *Aṅgānām* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.86. *Asaṃbuddhau* is continued from P. 7.1.92. The *vidheya* is (*anAṄ*), continued from P. 7.1.93.

3. The function of *ca* is to reinforce the word *sau* from P. 7.1.93, which otherwise would have been discontinued because P. 7.1.93 is regarded as an associative digression. See *FANU*, p. 199.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *ṛT* :

kartā 'one who does,' *hartā* 'one who takes away,' *mātā* 'mother,' *pitā* 'father,' *bhrātā* 'brother'

(2) For *uśanas* :

uśanā

(3) For *purudaṃśas* :

purudaṃśā

(4) For *anehas* :

anehā

5. To make clear that the rule only applies in the case of *asaṃbuddhi*, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples (*he*) *kartaḥ* 'o one who does,' (*he*) *mātaḥ* 'o mother,' (*he*) *pitaḥ* 'o father,' (*he*) *purudaṃśaḥ* 'o one who abounds in mighty deeds,' (*he*) *anehaḥ* 'o one who is without rival' and (*he*) *uśanaḥ* 'o Uśanas.' But in the case of *uśanas* in the sg. voc. *anAṄ* is also applied : (*he*) *uśanan*.

The *KV* notes that in the case of *uśanas* the prohibition of the deletion of *n* by P. 8.2.8 is optional, as shown in the form (*he*) *uśana* Thus in the sg. voc. we have three forms, (*he*) *uśanaḥ* (P. 7.1.94), (*he*) *uśanan* (P. 8.2.8) and (*he*) *uśana* (optional application of P. 8.2.8). Compare Whitney, § 416.

6. The *KV* then quotes a *ślokavārttika* stating just that. It reads *saṃbodhane tūśanasas trirūpam sāntaṃ tathā nāntam athāpy adantam / mādhyandinir vaṣṭi guṇaṃ tvigante napuṃsake vyāghrapadāṃ variṣṭhaḥ* 'in the voc., however, *uśanas* has three forms, ending in *s*, ending in *n* and ending in short *a*. (So) Mādhyandini maintains. But the best among the descendants of *Vyāghrapād* (maintains) *guṇa* in the neuter, given a form ending in an *iK*-vowel.' An example for *guṇa* in the sg. voc. of a neuter *iganta* form is (*he*) *trapo* 'o piece of tin,' quoted by the *Padamañjarī*. Reference is to the opinion of two grammarians. See *DSG, s.vv. mādhyandinī śikṣā* and *vaiyāghrapadya*.

7. The *KV* finally notes that the *anubandha T* has been added to *ṛ* in order to remove doubt. The doubt is about sandhi. The *Nyāsa* explains that once *yaṆ-ādeśa* is applied in the sequence *ṛ- uśana*, we will never know whether the stem ending in vowel *ṛ* or a stem ending in *r*. To make clear that reference is to the short vowel only, the *T* has been added.

8. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.95 TṚCVAT KROṢṬUḤ '(the nominal base *aṅga*) *kroṣṭu* "jackal" is treated like (ending in) *tṛC*, (if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately, except the sg. voc.)'

1. This is an *atideśasūtra* prescribing treatment like a *tṛjanta* form for *kroṣṭu*, on the conditions stated. For *atideśa* and the use of °*vat* see P. 7.1.90, under 1.

2. The *uddeśya* is *kroṣṭuḥ* (*aṅgaṃ sarvanāmasthāne asaṃbuddhau*). Here *kroṣṭuḥ* discontinues *ṛduśanas...anehasām* from P. 7.1.94. *Aṅgam* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmasthane* is continued from P. 7.1.86. *Asaṃbuddhau* is continued from P. 7.1.92. The *vidheya* is *tṛjvat*. It discontinues *anAṄ* from P. 7.1.93. It is interpreted as 'ending in *tṛC*' by *PN, pbh.* 23. Reference is to the *kṛt* suffix *tṛC* prescribed by P. 3.3.169 in the sense of an agent deserving of the action concerned.

The word *kroṣṭu* is an *uṇādi tuN*-derivation by *Uṇādisūtra* 1.72 (*SK*, Caukhambā Sanskrit Pratisthan, Delhi 1994, p. 521). As stated by Whitney, § 343 k., before the *sarvanāmasthāna* case endings (except the sg. voc.) the corresponding forms of *kroṣṭṛ* are substituted for *kroṣṭu*.

3. The *KV* explains that because of the nearness (in sense) the form transferred is that of the verbal base *kruś-* ending in *tṛC*, not just of any verbal base from which a *tṛjanta* form can be derived. Reference is to P. 1.1.50. The resulting form *kroṣṭṛ* 'howler' is *antodātta*, according to P. 6.1.163 for a form marked with *C*.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *kroṣṭā* (sg. nom.), *kroṣṭārau* (du. nom. / acc.), *kroṣṭāraḥ* (pl. nom.), and *kroṣṭāram* (sg. acc.).

5. To make clear that the rule only applies before a *sarvanāmasthāna* case ending, the *KV* quotes the pl. acc. *kroṣṭūn* as the counterexample.

To make clear that the rule only applies on the condition *asaṃbuddhau*, the *KV* quotes the sg. voc. *(he) kroṣṭo* as the counterexample. *Guṇa* of the final vowel is by P. 7.3.108.

6. We have a *Ślokavārttika* and 14 *Vts* on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96. They are better dealt with in connection with P. 7.1.96.

7.1.96 STRIYĀṂ CA 'also, in the fem. gender (the nominal base *aṅga kroṣṭu* "jackal" is treated like ending in *tṛC*)'

1. This is an *atideśasūtra*, prescribing treatment like a *tṛjanta* form for *kroṣṭu* in the fem. For *atideśa* see P. 7.1.90, under 1.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*kroṣṭuḥ aṅgam*) *striyām*. *Kroṣṭuḥ aṅgam* is continued from P. 7.1.95. The *KV* explicitly says that the present rule deals with non-*sarvanāmasthāna* endings, and that before these endings the word *kroṣṭu* is treated like ending in *tṛC* in the fem. In fact, *striyām* discontinues *sarvanāmasthāne asaṃbuddhau*. Thus, in the fem. gender *kroṣṭu* becomes *kroṣṭṛ* before all case endings, without condition. *Kroṣṭṛ* is *antodātta* by P. 6.1.163. *Striyām* is the general meaning condition denoting fem. gender. Compare, for instance, P. 3.3.94; 4.1.3. The term *striyām* is never used by Pāṇini to refer to fem. suffixes, like *ṬāP*, *ṄīP*, etc. The *vidheya* is *tṛjvat*, continued from P. 7.1.95.

The function of *ca* in the present rule is that of boundary marker. See *FANU*, p. 36, 232.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* is *kroṣṭrī* 'a female jackal' (sg. nom.), *kroṣṭrībhyām* (du. instr.) and *kroṣṭrībhiḥ* (pl. instr.). Normally, in the fem. gender the

suffix *ṄIP* is added by P. 4.1.5. That gives us *kroṣṭrī*.

As regards accentuation, the derivation of the fem. stem is as follows:

(1) *kroṣṭu* + *ṄĪṢ* P. 4.1.41
(2) *kroṣṭṛC* + *ī* P. 7.1.96

Here the final *ṛ* of *kroṣṭṛ* is *udātta* by P. 6.1.163, whereas *ṄĪṢ* is *udātta* by P. 3.1.3.

(3) *kroṣṭṛ* + *ī* P. 6.1.77; P. 6.1.174
kroṣṭrī.

Thus the derived form is *antodātta*, whether we apply the *sati śiṣṭa* accent rule (*Vt.* IX on P. 6.1.158), or not.

4. The *KV* notes that some grammarians (*kecit*; see P. 7.1.30, under 5), read *kroṣṭu* in the *gaurādi-gaṇa* (P. 4.1.41; see under no. 147 in Böhtlingk's edition of the *gaṇapāṭha*). P. 4.1.41 prescribes the suffix *ṄĪṢ* to form the fem. of the words *gaura*, etc. Now, if, against Pāṇinian usage, *striyām* is understood to refer to a fem. suffix. *ṄĪṢ* becomes the *nimitta* of *tṛjvadbhāva* for *kroṣṭu*. The implication is that, when *ṄĪṢ* disappears because of *luk*-deletion by P. 1.2.49, there can be no *tṛjvadbhāva* any more.

The example quoted by the *KV* in this connection is a *taddhita* formation. We have the usage *pañcakroṣṭṛbhī rathaiḥ* in the sense of *pañcabhiḥ kroṣṭrībhiḥ krītaiḥ* '(with chariots) bought for five female jackals.' The expression has been borrowed from Patañjali (*Mbh.* III, p. 273, line 15). As explained by the *Nyāsa*, cp.-formation is by P. 2.1.51. Then the *taddhita* suffix *ṬHaK* is added by P. 5.1.19 in the sense defined by P. 5.1.37. Subsequently, *ṬHaK* is *luk*-deleted by P. 5.1.28. Also, the fem. suffix, *ṄĪṢ*, is *luk*-deleted, by P. 1.2.49. Since these are *luk*-deletions, P. 1.1.62 is not applicable. But, if no *ṄĪṢ*, then no *tṛjvadbhāva*, as stated above. The form derived will be **pañcakroṣṭubhiḥ*, which is not desired. This being so, a special provision has to be made, saying that, even if the fem. suffix is deleted, *tṛjvadbhāva* can be applied.

We note that the difficulty does not arise in the view that *striyām* refers to fem. gender. In this view, *tṛjvadbhāva* is not dependent on any fem. suffix. Therefore, we can justify the usage *pañcakroṣṭṛbhiḥ* without difficulty.

5. The *KV* finally notes that those who do not want to read *kroṣṭu* in the *gaurādi-gaṇa* must take the word *striyām* in the rule as an *arthanirdeśa* 'mention of a meaning-condition,' in the sense that the word *kroṣṭu* when used in the sense of a female is treated like ending in *tṛC*. In that case, the fem. stem is not formed with *ṄĪṢ*, but with *ṄĪP*, by P. 4.1.5. Also, the resulting form will be *antodātta* only, by P. 6.1.174.

The derivation of the fem. stem is as follows :

(1)	*kroṣṭu*		(in the sense of 'female animal')
(2)	*kroṣṭṛC*		P. 7.1.96; 6.1.163
(3)	*kroṣṭṛ* +	*ṄĪP*	P. 4.1.5; 3.1.4 (*ṄĪP* is *anudātta*)
(4)	*kroṣṭr* +	*Ī*	P. 6.1. 77
(5)	*kroṣṭr* +	*Ī*	P. 6.1.174
	krostrĪ.		

6. As stated in connection with P. 7.1.95, under 6, quite a few grammatical comments are available on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96.

6.1 Usually, Patañjali quotes *Ślokavārttikas* after his commentary on *Vts*, but at present the order is reversed. In his introductory *bhāṣya* to the first line of the *Ślokavārttika*, which consists of three lines, Patañjali raises the question whether the word *vibhaktau* 'if a case ending follows immediately' is continued in P. 7.1.96 (presumably from P. 7.1.73), or not. That, apparently, makes a difference. Patañjali then immediately quotes the first part of the *Ślokavt*. It says that, if P. 7.1.96 is interpreted as *tṛjvat striyāṃ vibhaktau* 'if *tṛjvadbhāva* (is applied to *kroṣṭu*) in the fem., provided that a case ending follows immediately,' we cannot justify the *bv*. cp. *kroṣṭrībhakti* 'one whose object of worship is a female jackal' (P. 4.3.95).

Why not? The implication of the *ced*-phrase is that *tṛjvadbhāva* in the fem. of *kroṣṭu* is made dependent on a following case ending. Thus, if the case ending is *luk*-deleted, *tṛjvadbhāva* cannot be applied to *kroṣṭu* in the fem. That is shown by the example. In the stage (((*kroṣṭu* + *Ī*) + *sU*)) + ((*bhakti* + *sU*))) + $Su^{op.}$, once the internal case endings are deleted by P. 2.4.71, we would not be able to apply *tṛjvadbhāva* to *kroṣṭu*. The form derived would be **kroṣṭubhakti*, which is not desired. The argument is rather amazing. Why should *tṛjvadbhāva* of *kroṣṭu* in the fem. be conditioned by a case ending? The answer is, only if *vibhaktau* is read in P. 7.1.96. Patañjali tries to avoid the difficulty by a trick. He assumes *praśliṣṭasandhi* in the word *striyām*, by analysing it as *strī* + *Ī* + *ām* where *Ī* stands for a fem. suffix. Thus *striyām* is taken to mean 'provided that (the suffix) *Ī* of the fem. gender (has been

added).' By this analysis, *strī*, that is, *strī* + *ī*, stands for a fem. suffix. The point of this interpretation is that *tṛjvadbhāva* has already been applied before the *luk*-deletion of the case endings in the example quoted. Therefore we have no difficulty in deriving the desired form, even if the rule reads *vibhaktau*.

For the argument of the remaining two lines of the *Ślokavārttika* we refer to the summary provided by the *KV*. See under 4. and 5., above.

6.2 The *Vts* on the combined rules P. 7.1.95-96 fall into three groups. *Vts* I-VI deal with the question of *śāstrātideśa* versus *rūpātideśa*. *Vts* VII-IX deal with the question whether P. 7.1.95-96 are redundant, and *Vts* X-XIV deal with the augments *nUM* and *nUṬ*.

Vt. I takes up the *śāstrātideśa* position. Here we leave out of account the comparison made in *Vt.* I by *yathā ciṇi tadvat*. Also, we will leave out of account *Vt.* II, because of the technicalities involved, which, moreover, add nothing to clarify the present rule.

Śāstrātideśa means an extended application of a particular rule or particular rules. In our case, it means that a rule applicable to *tṛjanta* forms is extended to *kroṣṭu*. For *tṛjanta* forms lengthening (*dīrghatva*) is applicable by P. 6.4.11, *guṇa* by P. 7.3.110, and *anAṄ* by P. 7.1.94. Since *tṛjvadbhāva* has been prescribed for *kroṣṭu* by P. 7.1.95, both rules (or operations) mentioned are extended to *kroṣṭu*. We note that in the present context no clear distinction is made between *śāstrātideśa* and *kāryātideśa*. In any case, the difference between these two types of *atideśa* is procedural only See *STHĀNI*, Pt. I, n. 49.

Patañjali (*bhāṣya* on *Vt.* II, *evaṃ tarhy ayam anyo doṣo jāyate*, etc.) warns that we should not misunderstand what is meant by *śāstrātideśa*. It amounts to meaning a widening of the application of rules. It does not only mean that a rule which contains the word *tṛC*, like P. 6.4.11, is extended to *kroṣṭu* by P. 7.1.96. It also means that grammatical operations applicable to words ending in *tṛC* are extended to *kroṣṭu*, like *guṇa* (P. 7.3.110), or *anAṄ* (P. 7.1.94). In these two rules the word *tṛC* is not mentioned, but *ṛT* is. Still, the grammatical operations prescribed by these rules are applicable by the *tṛjvat śāstrātideśa*, because *tṛjanta* words are *ṛdanta* words anyway. Otherwise, we would have only one example of a rule which becomes applicable, namely, P. 6.4.11, where the word *tṛC* is directly stated.

Rūpātideśa means the transference of a word form to a word which does not have that form. In our case, this means that a *tṛjanta* form is transferred to

the stem *kroṣṭu*. Thereby *kroṣṭu* becomes *kroṣṭṛ* for all practical purposes, by *sthānyādeśabhāva*.

Vt. III is an *iti ced Vt.* It says that, if we adopt *rūpātideśa* (instead of *śāstrātideśa*), there is an undesired possibility for substitution of the whole. The difficulty involved is, do we substitute *trC* for the *sthānin kroṣṭu* as a whole? *Vt.* IV says, no, we can manage by *rūpātideśa*. *Vt.* V states the reason, namely, that *trC* is to be interpreted to mean *tṛjanta*, by what has become *PN*, *pbh.* 23. Then does this imply that *kroṣṭu* is to be treated like like *paktṛ* 'one who cooks,' or *kartṛ* 'one who does, which are *tṛjanta* forms, and be replaced accordingly? *Vt.* VI says, no, because we have P. 1.1.50, which says that a substitute is supposed to replace only that *sthānin* which is phonetically nearest. In addition we have what has become *PN*, *pbh.*14, which says that the substitute replaces only that *sthānin* which is (phonetically and) semantically nearest. So *kroṣṭu* will only be replaced by *kroṣṭṛ*.

The *rūpātideśa* view appears to work better than the *śāstrātideśa* view, because, once we have transferred the form *kroṣṭṛ* to *kroṣṭu*, the rules prescribing lengthening (P. 6.4.11), *anAṄ* (P. 7.1.94) and *guṇa* (P. 7.3.110) will become applicable automatically. The question where *tṛC* is directly stated does not arise. Once *kroṣṭu* has been practically replaced by *kroṣṭṛ*, we can manage by *sthānyādeśabhāva*. Then apply whatever rules are applicable.

Vt. VII says that in the domain of *tṛC* the statement of *tṛjvat* (by P. 7.1.95) is redundant, because the *tṛjanta* form (*kroṣṭṛ*) conveys the sense of *mṛga* 'wild animal.' The *Vt.* means to say that there is no point in replacing *kroṣṭu* by *kroṣṭṛ*. We can simply derive *kroṣṭṛ* by adding *tṛC* to *kruś-*. Thereby *kroṣṭṛ* becomes a stem in its own right. Then what could be the purpose of P. 7.1.95? Patañjali explains that P. 7.1.95 must have been phrased to block the *tuN-anta* form *krostu* in certain environments. That is to say, we do not need the form *kroṣṭu* for having it replaced by *kroṣṭṛ*. *Kroṣṭu* and *kroṣṭṛ* are independent forms, existing side by side.

In fact, we can derive the stems *kroṣṭṛ* and *kroṣṭu* independently, as follows :

A. (1)	*kruśA-*		*Dhp.* 1.909
(2)	*kruś*	+ *tṛC*	P. 3.1.133
(3)	*krośr*	+ *tṛ*	P. 7.3.86 (no *idāgama*, P. 7.2.10)
(4)	*kroṣ*	+ *tṛ*	P. 8.2.36
(5)	*kroṣ*	+ *ṭṛ*	P. 8.4.41
	kroṣṭṛ.		

B. (2) *kruś* + *tuN* *Uṇādisūtra* 1.72 (see *SK*, 1994, p. 521)
(3) *kroś* + *tu* P. 7.3.86 (no *iḍāgama*, P. 7.2.9)
(4)-(5) see under A.
kroṣṭu.

The two derivations result in two independent stems, *kroṣṭṛ* and *kroṣṭu*. Out of these two stems *kroṣṭu* is never used in the fem. That may be called a systematic gap in language. Compare *ATA*, Introduction, p. vii (*anabhidhānāt*). Gaps happen in language. In the case of *kroṣṭu* and *kroṣṭṛ* we can even define them more precisely. Before *sarvanāsthāna* ending *kroṣṭṛ* supplements *kroṣṭu*. Before endings beginning with a consonant *kroṣṭu* supplements *kroṣṭṛ*. Elsewhere both stems are found in usage, except in the fem. where the stem *kroṣṭṛ* only is used. The gap being systematic, P. 7.1.95-96 state the same fact. We note that Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya* 3.13, which deals with *liṅga* 'gender,' does not mention *kroṣṭu / kroṣṭṛ*.

Vt. VIII is an *iti ced Vt*. It says that, if P. 7.1.95-96 are meant to block the *tuN*-derivation (as the basis for replacing it by *kroṣṭṛ*), then we can manage like elsewhere also. Where elsewhere? According to Patañjali, where forms prescribed generally, without further specification, are seen as having a fixed domain. He provides some illustrations of the point made by the *Vt*. In the *Dhp*. the verbal base *ghṛ-* (quoted as *gharati*; according to Kaiyaṭa, reference is to *gṛ- / ghṛ-* mentioned in the *Dhp* 1.984, 985) is mentioned generally. No specific, derived forms are provided, like *gharati, jaghāra*, etc. But in *ghṛtam* 'ghee,' *ghṛṇā* 'a warm feeling' and *gharma* 'heat' (the latter two words are actually derived from a different verbal base *ghṛ-*) we do have specific wordforms showing the domain in which systematic use is made of *ghṛ-*. So also in the case of *kroṣṭṛ* and *kroṣṭu*. They are general forms not providing specific information about declension. We also have specific case formations, which show that sometimes use is made of *kroṣṭu*, and sometimes of *kroṣṭṛ*. The purpose of P. 7.1.95-96 is precisely to delimit these uses.

Vt. IX says that the statement of *vā* (meaning *vibhāṣā*, in P. 7.1.97; tradition does not distinguish between *vā* and *vibhāṣā*) is redundant, because (the option) is naturally established. The option regards the use of *kroṣṭu* and *kroṣṭṛ* before the instr. case endings. etc., beginning with a vowel. The idea is that here it is up to the speaker, or his *vivakṣā*, to use either *kroṣṭu* or *kroṣṭṛ*, when reference is to a jackal. The argument of the *Vt*. is wrong, because the word *vibhāṣā* in P. 7.1.97 makes it clear that the *kroṣṭṛ*-forms before the instr., etc. endings are the non-preferred forms.

Vt. X says that the addition of the augment *nUM* (by P. 7.1.73) prevails over *guṇa* (P. 7.3.110), *vṛddhi* (P. 7.2.115), the substitution of *auT* (P. 7.3.119) and

tṛjvadbhāva (P. 7.1.95-96) by *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict procedure in which the earlier rule prevails.' The reason stated is wrong. The *nUM*-rule is a word-building rule. Therefore it prevails. To establish this, the *Vt.* is not required. See *AP* IV, p. 26.

Vt. XI says that the addition of the augment *nUṬ* (by P. 7.1.54) prevails over that of *nUM* (P. 7.1.73), over the substitution of *ṛ* for the vowel *r* (P. 7.2.100), and over *tṛjvadbhāva* (P. 7.1.95-96). The word *pūrvavipratiṣedhena* is continued from *Vt.* X. Here also the reason is wrong. In relation to the *nUM*-rule the *nUṬ* rule is an *apavāda*. In relation to the other two grammatical operations we will say that the *nUṬ*-rule is a word-building rule. Therefore in both cases it prevails. To establish this, the *Vt.* is not required. See *AP* IV, p. 26.

Vt. XII is a *na vā Vt.* It says, we better not state that the *nUṬ*-substitution prevails over the *r*-substitution by P. 7.2.100. We can manage because of the prohibition of the *r*-substitution. Patañjali explains that statement must be phrased saying that in the domain of *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.54) the *r*-substitution is prohibited. Thereby we can justify the forms *tisṛṇām* 'of three' and *catusṛṇām* 'of four.' For the derivation of *tisṛṇām* see *AP* IX, p. 12.

The point of the *Vt.* is that we can speak of *vipratiṣedha* and *pūrvavipratiṣedha* only when the two rules concerned are *tulyabala* 'of equal force.' See *AP* IV, p. 17. But the *nUṬ*-rule and the *r*-substitution rule are not *tulyabala.* The substitution rule is a special rule (*apavāda*), whereas the *nUṬ*-rule is a general rule (*utsarga*). Therefore the *r*-substitution rule will prevail. This is not desired. That is why we must phrase a prohibition of the *r*-substitution in regard of the *nUṬ*-rule.

Vt. XIII points out that, otherwise, if no prohibition of the *r*-substitution is phrased, this substitution, being an *apavāda*, would prevail over all grammatical operations concerned, namely, *guṇa* (P. 7.3.110), *dīrgha* (P. 6.1.101) and *nUṬ* (P. 7.1.74), and set them aside.

Vt. XIV draws the conclusion. It says that, therefore, wherever the augment *nUṬ* becomes applicable the *r*-substitution should be prohibited.

Patañjali is not satisfied. He thinks that the prohibition referred to is not required because we have a clue from which we understand that the *r*-substitution does not take place in the pl. gen. The clue is provided by P. 6.4.4, which prohibits lengthening by P. 6.4.3. See *AP* IX, p. 11-12. Suppose, the *r*-substitution would have prevailed over the augment *nUṬ*. That would have resulted in the undesired forms

*tisrām and *catasrām. Here we cannot apply *nUṬ* any more because the preceding *aṅga* does not end in a short vowel. That gives us the clue that the *r*-substitution is not to be applied before the addition of *nUṬ*.

7.1.97 VIBHĀṢĀ TṚTĪYĀDIṢV ACI '(the nominal base *aṅga kroṣṭu* "jackal" is) preferably not (treated like ending in *tṛC*), if a case ending beginning with a vowel follows immediately, starting from the instr. case endings'

1. This is an *atideśūtra* prescribing the non-preferential treatment like *tṛC* for *kroṣṭu* on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*kroṣṭuḥ aṅgaṃ tṛjvat*) *tṛtīyādiṣu aci*. Here *kroṣṭuḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.95. *Aṅgam* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from P. 6.4.1. *Tṛjvat* is continued from P. 7.1.95. *Tṛtīyā* (sc. *vibhakti*) is the *laukika* 'non-technical' name given to the third set of case endings enumerated in P. 4.1.2. *Tṛtīyādiṣu* is a *parasaptamī*. See *KA*, n. 1. *Aci* is interpreted as *aj-ādau* by the *tadādividhi* (*Vt*. XXIX on P. 1.1.72). *Aci* is also a *parasaptamī*. The lack of syntactic agreement between *tṛtīyādiṣu* and the qualifier *aci* is due to *sūtra*-style. The correct form of the *sūtra* is *tṛtīyādiṣu akṣu*. Compare *tṛtīyādiṣu ajādiṣu* in the *KV*. But the pl. form *akṣu* is never used in the A. *Tṛtīyādiṣu aci* discontinues *striyām* from P. 7.1.96. The *vidheya* is *vibhāṣā*. For the meaning of *vibhāṣā* see Kiparsky 1979, p. 1. According to the *Nyāsa*, the *vibhāṣā* is of the *prāptavibhāṣā* type. That is to say, an operation which has already been prescribed is made optional in a new environment. Otherwise the operation would apply obligatory.

3. The present rule may be regarded as an associative digression, in the sense that it jointly applies with P. 7.1.96 in one and the same derivation. It optionally restricts *tṛjvadbhāva* of *kroṣṭu* prescribed by P. 7.1.96 before certain case endings. See *FANU*, p. 197.

4. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *kroṣṭrā / kroṣṭunā* (sg. instr.), *kroṣṭre / kroṣṭave* (sg. dat.), *kroṣṭuḥ / kroṣṭoḥ* (sg. abl. / gen.), *kroṣṭari / kroṣṭau* (sg. loc.) and *kroṣṭroh / kroṣṭvoh* (du. gen. / loc.). Here the forms quoted in second position are the preferred ones. They follow the regular paradigm of *kroṣṭru*.

The *Nyāsa* explains that in *kroṣṭunā* P. 7.3.120 is applied for the case ending; that in *kroṣṭave guṇa* is applied by P. 7.3.111; that in *kroṣṭuḥ* the substitution of *uT* for *ṛ* is by P. 6.1.111, and that deletion of *s* is by P. 8.2.24; that in *kroṣṭoḥ guṇa* is by P. 7.3.111 again, and that the single vowel substitute (for *e* + *a* of *ṄasI* and *Ṅas*

is by P. 6.1.110; that in *kroṣṭari* P. 7.3.110 is applied for *guṇa* of *ṛ*; and, finally, that in *kroṣṭau* the *au*-substitution is by P. 7.3.119.

5. To point out the significance of the word *tṛtīyādiṣu* in the rule, the *KV* quotes pl. acc. form *kroṣṭrūn* as the counterexample.

To point out the significance of the word *aci* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the du. and pl. instr. forms *kroṣṭṛbhyām* and *kroṣṭṛbhis*.

6. Finally, the *KV* quotes *Vts* X and XI on P. 7.1.95-96 as a combined statement. It reads *tṛjvadbhāvāt pūrvavipratiṣedhena nuṃnuṭau bhavataḥ* 'by conflict procedure in which the earlier rule prevails, (the augments) *nUM* and *nUT* prevail over *tṛjvadbhāva*.' The *Nyāsa* explains that both *tṛjvadbhāva* and *nUM / nUṬ* have scope for application elsewhere, but that the *nUM / nUṬ* rules prevail, because they have been prescribed by the earlier rule. For a discussion and rejection of the idea of *purvavipratiṣedha* see *AP* IV, p. 20-27, and for the *Vt.*in question (*Vt.* XI on P. 7.1.95-96), especially p. 26. Actually, this *Vt.* is not required, because the *nUM / nUṬ* rules are word-building rules, and that is why they prevail. See *AP* IV, p. 34-35, and P. 6.4.19, Excursus II, under 2.

The examples quoted are

(1) For *nUM* :

priyakroṣṭune 'raṇyāya 'for a forest to which jackals are dear' and *hatakroṣṭune vṛṣalakulāya* 'for a family of outcasts who possesses dead jackals.'

(2) For *nUT* :

kroṣṭūnām (pl. gen.)

7. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

7.1.98 CATUR-ANAḌUHOR ĀM UDĀTTAḤ '*āM*, which is *udātta*, (is inserted) after (the last vowel of the nominal base *aṅgas*) *catur* "four" and *anaḍuh* "draught-animal," (if a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the insertion of the augment *āM* in *catur* and *anaḍuh*, on the conditions stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *caturanaḍuhoḥ* (*aṅgayoḥ sarvanāmasthāne*). In *catur-anaḍuhoḥ* the du. gen. ending *os* is used with the value of *avayavaṣaṣṭī* (P. 1.1.47). It discontinues *kroṣṭuḥ* from P. 7.1.95. *Aṅgayoḥ* is continued (with *vibhaktivipariṇāma* from P. 6.4.1. *Sarvanāmasthāne* is continued from P. 7.1.86. *Tṛtīyādiṣu aci* from P. 7.1.97 is discontinued because this rule is an associative digression. See *FANU*, p. 197. The *vidheya* is *ām udāttaḥ*. *ĀM* is a *Mit* augment which, according to P. 1.1.47, is inserted after the last vowel of the stem concerned. *Udātta* is the high pitch accent defined by P. 2.2.29. The option term *vibhāṣā* from P. 7.1.97 is discontinued on account of the change of *vidheya* (see *FANU*, p. 272, convention 24), or because it belongs to an associative digression.

The *Nyāsa* notes that *sarvanāmasthāne* (in P. 7.1.86) is a section heading rule read with *svarita* (P. 1.3.11).

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are

(1) For *catur* :

catvāraḥ (nom. masc.)

(2) For *anaḍuh* :

anaḍvān (sg. nom.), *anaḍvāhau* (du. nom. / acc.), *anaḍvāhaḥ* (pl. nom.) and *anaḍvāham* (sg. acc.)

For *anaḍuh* compare P. 7.1.82.

4. The *KV* notes that the application of the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72) is desired. Thus the present rule also applies to *bv.* cps ending in *catur* and *anaḍuh*. Reference may also be made to *PN*, *pbh.* 29, *padāṅgādhikāre tasya ca tadantasya* 'in the sections dealing with *pada* and *aṅga* a stem stands both for itself and for that which ends with that (stem).'

The examples quoted are

(1) For a cp. ending in *catur* :

priyacatvāraḥ 'one to whom four are dear' (sg. nom. masc.), *priyacatvārau* 'the two to whom four are dear' (du. nom. / acc. masc.) and *priyacatvārāḥ* 'those to whom four are dear' (pl. nom. masc.). The *Nyāsa* notes that, according to *Vt.*

I on P. 2.2.35, pronominals and numerals take the first place in a *bv.* cp. But in the cps quoted *priya* takes the first place optionally by *Vt.* II on the same rule.

(2) For a cp. ending in *anaduh* :

priyānaḍvān 'one to whom draught-animals are dear,' (sg. nom. masc.), *priyānaḍvāhau* 'the two to whom draught-animals are dear,' (du. nom. masc) and *priyānaḍvāhaḥ* 'ones to whom draught-animals are dear' (pl. nom. masc.).

5. Finally, the *KV* quotes *Vt.*I on the rule, for which see below, under 6.

6. We have one *Vt.* on the rule. It says *anaḍuhaḥ striyāṃ veti vaktavyam* 'in connection with *anaḍuh ām* is optional in the fem.' The example quoted is *anaeuhī / anaḍvāhī*. The *KV* explains that we can justify the forms by reading them in the *gaurādi-gaṇa* (P. 4.1.41). In Böhtlingk's edition of the *gaṇapāṭha* the two forms figure under nos. 66 and 67.

7.1.99 AM SAṂBUDDHAU '*aM* (is inserted after the last vowel of the nominal base *aṅgas catur* "four" and *anaḍuh* "draught-animal,") if the sg. voc. case ending follows immediately'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the augment *am* for the sg. voc. of the two stems mentioned.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*caturanaḍuhoḥ aṅgayoḥ*) *saṃbuddhau*. Here *catur-anaḍuhoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.98. The *vidheya* is *aM*, which is *Mit*. It is inserted before the last vowel of the stem concerned by P. 1.1.47. It discontinues *ām udāttaḥ* from P. 7.1.98.

The *KV* explains that P. 7.1.99 is an *apavāda* 'exception' to P. 7.1.98. By the previous rule the augment would be *ām*.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are (*he*) *priyacatvaḥ* 'o one to whom four are dear, and (*he*) *priyānaḍvan* 'o one to whom draught-animals are dear.' See P. 7.1.98, under 4, for the application of the *tadantavidhi*. See *PN*, *pbh.*29.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

5. The present rule closes the sub-section dealing with *sarvanāmasthāna* endings.

7.1.100 ṜTA ID DHĀTOḤ '*iT* (comes) in place of (the final phoneme of) a verbal base (*aṅga* ending in) long *ṝ*'

1. The is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of short *i* for long *ṝ* in the position stated.

2. The *uddeśya* is *ṝtaḥ dhātoḥ* (*aṅgasya*). Here *ṝtaḥ* is interpreted as *ṝdantasya* by the *tadantavidhi* (P. 1.1.72). The *anubandha T* has been added to restrict the variety of the vowel *ṛ* to long *ṝ* only, by P. 1.1.70. *Dhātoḥ* is a technical gen. by P. 1.1.49. According to P. 1.1.52, the substitute comes in place of the final phoneme of the linguistic element concerned only. The term *dhātu* has been defined by enumeration by P. 1.3.1. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. The *vidheya* is *iT*. Here also the *anubandha T* has a restrictive function.

The present rule opens a short sub-section dealing with substitution, until the end of the *pāda*. Thereby all elements from the previous rule have been discontined.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *kirati* 'he scatters,' *girati* 'he swallows,' *āstīrṇam* 'covered, spread over' (sg. nom. / acc. ntr.) and *viśīrṇam* 'shattered' (sg. nom. / acc. ntr.).

The derivation of *kirati* is as follows :

(1)	*kṝ-*				*Dhp.* 6.116
(2)	*kṝ*		+	*lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(3)	*kṝ*		+	*tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(4)	*kṝ*	+ *Śa*	+	*ti*	P 3.1.68
(5)	*kir*	+ *a*	+	*ti*	P. 7.1.100; 1.1.51
	kirati.				

The derivation of *āstīrṇam* is as follows :

(1)	*stṝÑ-*			*Dhp.* 9.14
(2)	*ā* + *stṝ*			
(3)	(*āstṝ*	+ *Kta*)	+ *sU*	P. 3.2.102; 3.4.70; P. 4.1.2
(4)	(*āstir*	+ *ta*)	+ *s*	P. 7.1.100; 1.1.51
(5)	(*āstir*	+ *ta*)	+ *am*	P. 7.1.24
(6)	*āstir*	+ *tam*		P. 6.1.107
(7)	*āstir*	+ *nam*		P. 8.2.42

(8) *āstīr* + *nam* P. 8.2.77
(9) *āstīr* + *ṇam* P .8.4.1
āstīrṇam.

4. To point out the significance of the word *dhātoḥ* in the rule, the *KV* quotes the counterexamples *mātṝṇām* 'of the mothers' and *pitṝṇām* 'of the fathers.' These are nominal base *aṅgas*, not *dhātus*. The *Nyāsa* explains that in the examples lengthening of *i* is by P. 8.2.77.

5. The *KV* states that inclusion in the rule is desired also of forms not directly stated as ending in long *ṝ* in the *Dhp.*, but resulting from the application of rules, like *cikīrṣati* 'he wishes to do.' This is a desiderative form derived from *kṛ-* ending in short *ṛ*. The application of P. 7.1.100 is desired after the lengthening of short *ṛ* by P. 6.4.16. The resulting long vowel *ṝ* is called *lākṣaṇika* 'derived by rule application.'

6. We have no *Vts* on the rule, but there is a *bhāṣya* on the combined rules P. 7.1.100-102. The *bhāṣya* will be dealt with in connection with P. 7.1.102.

7.1.101 UPADHĀYĀŚ CA 'also, (*iT* comes) in place of the prefinal (*ṝT* of a verbal base *aṅga*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of short *i* for the prefinal long *ṝ* of a verbal base.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ aṅgasya*) *upadhāyāḥ* (*ṝtaḥ*). Here *dhātoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.100, but with a change of value. Whereas in P. 1.1.100 *dhātoḥ* was a *sthāne ṣaṣṭhī*, in the present rule it can only be an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. The prefinal long *ṝ* is (the prefinal) part of the *dhātu*. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Upadhāyāḥ* qualifies *ṝtaḥ*, which is a technical genitive, by P. 1.1.47. *Upadhā* is defined by P. 1.1.65. The *vidheya* is (*iT*), continued from P. 7.1.100.

The function of *ca* is to show connection with the previous rule. At the same time, *ca* serves as a boundary marker. See *FANU*, p. 36, 232.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *kīrttayati* 'he menions / praises,' *kīrttayataḥ* 'the two of them mention / praise' and *kīrttayanti* 'they mention / praise.'

The derivation of *kīrttayati* is as follows :

(1)	*kṝtA-*				*Dhp.* 10.111
(2)	*kṝt*	+ *ṆiC*			P. 3.1.26
(3)	*kṝt*	+ *i*		+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(4)	*kṝt*	+ *i*		+ *tiP*	P. 3.4..78
(5)	*kṝt*	+ *i*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(6)	*kirt*	+ *i*	+ *a*	+ *ti*	P. 7.1.101
(7)	*kirt*	+ *e*	+ *a*	+ *ti*	P. 7.3.84
(8)	*kirt*	+ *ay*	+ *a*	+ *ti*	P. 6.1.78
(9)	*kīrt*	+ *ay*	+ *a*	+ *ti*	P. 8.2.78
	kīrtayati.				

4. For the *bhāṣya* on the combined rules P. 7.1.100-102 see under P. 7.1.102.

7.1.102 UD OṢṬHYAPŪRVASYA '*uT* (comes) in place of (the final phoneme of a verbal base *aṅga* ending in *ṝT*) which (*ṝT*) is preceded by an *oṣṭhya* "labial"'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* prescribing the substitution of short *u* for final long *ṝ* of a verbal base when preceded by a labial.

2. The *uddeśya* is (*dhātoḥ aṅgasya*) *oṣṭhyapūrvasya ṝtaḥ*. Here *dhātoḥ* is continued from P. 7.1.100 with the same value of a *sthāne ṣaṣṭhī*. Then apply P. 1.1.52. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Oṣṭhyapūrvasya* qualifies *ṝtaḥ* which is itself a technical gen. by P.1.1.49. It discontinues *upadhāyāḥ* from P. 7.1.101. *Oṣṭhya* is a term known from *Prātiśākhya* literature. It stands for labials. The *vidheya* is *uT*. It discontinues *iT* from P. 7.1.100.

3. The examples quoted by the *KV* are *pūrtāḥ piṇḍāḥ* 'fully prepared, rounded rice balls offered to the ancestors,' *pupurṣati* 'he wishes to fill,' *mumūrṣati* 'he wishes to die' and *susvūrṣati* 'he wishes to make a sound.'

The *prakriyā* of *pūrtta* is as follows:

(1)	*pṝ-*		*Dhp.* 9.19
(2)	*pṝ*	+ *Kta*	P. 3.4.70
(3)	*pur*	+ *ta*	P. 7.1.102; 1.1.51
(4)	*pūr*	+ *ta*	P. 8.2.76
	pūrta.		

The substitution of *n* for the *t* of *Kta* is specifically prohibited in the case of *pṝ-* 'to fill' by P. 8.2.57.

The verbal bases *mṛ-* and *svṛ-* are quoted in the *Dhp.* 6.110 as *mṛṄ-* and *Dhp.* 1.979 as *svṛ-* with short *ṛ*. The *KV* presents it as example for the present rule because *v* is labiodental. The *prakriyā* of *mumūrṣati* is as follows:

(1)		*mṛṄ-*				*Dhp.* 6.110
(2)		*mṛ*	+ *saN*			P. 3.1.23
(3)		*mṝ*	+ *sa*			P. 6.4.16
(4)		*mur*	+ *sa*			P. 7.1.102
(5)	*mur* +	*mur*	+ *sa*			P. 6.1.9
(6)	*mu°* +	*mur*	+ *sa*			P. 7.4.60
(7)	*mu* +	*mur*	+ *sa*		+ *lAṬ*	P. 3.2.123
(8)	*mu* +	*mur*	+ *sa*		+ *tiP*	P. 3.4.78
(9)	*mu* +	*mur*	+ *sa*	+ *ŚaP*	+ *ti*	P. 3.1.68
(10)	*mu* +	*mur*	+	*sa*	+ *ti*	P. 6.1.97
(11)	*mu* +	*mūr*	+	*sa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.2.77
(11)	*mu* +	*mūr*	+	*ṣa*	+ *ti*	P. 8.3.59

mumūrṣati.

4. The *KV* then points out that the rule not only applies in connection with *osthya* sounds, but also in connection with the *dantyoṣṭhya* 'labio-dental' sound *v*. The examples are *vuvūrṣati ṛtvijam* 'he wishes to choose an *ṛtvij*' and *prāvuvūrṣati kambalam* 'he wishes to put on a wollen wrapper.' Here the term *oṣṭhya* is taken as referring to a part of the *aṅga* on account of nearness in sense. Therefore when the verbal base *ṛ-* 'to go' is preceded by *sam*, the rule does not apply, and we derive the form *samīrṇa* 'brought together' (?) by P. 7.1.100, and not *samūrṇa. Here the *oṣṭhya* sound *m* is not part of the verbal base, but belongs to the preverb.

5. Finally, the *KV* quotes a *Bhāṣyavārttika* mentioned in the *bhāsya* on the combined rules, but already earlier stated, e.g. *Mbh.* I, p. 306, line 3-4, on *Vt.* VII on P. 1.4.2. It says *ittvottvābhyāṃ guṇavṛddhī bhavato vipratiṣedhena* '*guṇa* and *vṛddhi* prevail over the substitution of *i* and *u* by conflict procedure.' Reference is to the procedure laid down by P. 1.4.2. See *AP* IV, p. 14. The examples, mainly borrowed from Patañjali's *bhāṣya*, are *āstaraṇam* 'a covering,' *āstārakaḥ* 'one who covers,' *niparaṇam* 'the act of putting down rice for deceased relatives,' *nipārakaḥ* 'one who puts down rice for deceased relatives,' *nigaraṇam* 'the act of swallowing' and *nigārakaḥ* 'one who swallows.'

6. We have no *Vts* on P. 7.1.100-102, but there is a *bhāṣya*. It begins with the *Bhāṣyavārttika* mentioned under 5, above. Examples for instances in which both *ittva / uttva* and *guṇavṛddhī* are applicable, and in which *guṇavṛddhī* prevail, are

quoted. Patañjali thinks that *guṇa* (P. 7.3.84 and 86) prevails over *ittva* (P. 7.1.100-101 and *uttva* (P. 7.1.102) according to the *nitya*-principle. (*PN, pbh.* 42). That is to say, *guṇa* is applicable invariably, whether before or after the *iT*- / *uT*-substitutions. In fact, the *guṇa*-rule (P. 7.3.84) prevails by *apavādatva*, and the *vṛddhi*-rule (P. 7.2.115) by *sāmarthya*. Compare *AP* IX, p. 227-228.

7.1.103 BAHULAṂ CHANDASI 'in the Vedic language (*uT*) variously (comes in place of) the final phoneme of a verbal base *aṅga* ending in *ṝT*)'

1. This is a *vidhisūtra* noting a peculiarity of the Vedic language regarding the substitution of short *u* in place of long *ṝ* in the position stated. Compare *AP* IX, P. 6.4.58, under 1 and 2.

2. The *uddeśya* is *chandasi* (*dhātoḥ aṅgasya oṣṭhyapūrvasya ṝtaḥ*). For *chandas* see *ATA*, n. 101. *Dhātoḥ* and *ṝtaḥ* are continued from P. 7.1.100 with identical value. *Aṅgasya* is continued from P. 6.4.1. *Oṣṭhyapūrvasya* is continued from P. 7.1.102. The *vidheya* is (*uT*) *bahulam*. Here *uT* is continued from P. 7.1.102. For *bahulam* see *AP* V, p. 72.

3. The *KV* explains that the *uT*-substitution prescribed by P. 7.1.102 for long *ṝ* preceded by a labial is also seen in the Vedic language when the long *ṝ* is not preceded by a labial. The examples are *mitrāvaruṇau taturiḥ* '(the stallion) which you , Mitra and Varuṇa, (have presented), the conquering one' (ṚgV. 4.39.2) and *dūre hy adhvā jaguriḥ* 'because the road leading into the distance...' (ṚgV. 10.108.1). The *Nyāsa* explains that *taturi* and *jaguri* are derived from the verbal bases *tṝ*- and *gṝ*- (by P. 3.2.171), with reduplication, and that the *a*-substitution in the reduplication syllable is by P. 7.4.66.

It also happens that the *uT*-substitution prescribed for long *ṝ*- preceded by a labial does not take place. The examples are *papritamam* 'granting to the highest degree' (*sg.* nom. / acc. ntr.) and *vavritamam* 'covering to the highest degree' (?), source unidentified. The *Nyāsa* explains that (like *taturi* and *jaguri*) these are *Ki-Kin* derivations of the verbal bases *pṝ*- and *vṝ*- by P. 3.2.171. The two suffixes mentioned function like *lIṬ*, and thus cause reduplication. Also *yaṆ-ādeśa* is applied. The suffix *tamaP* is added by P. 5.3.55.

4. There is no *bhāṣya* on the rule.

INDEX OF WORDS

Expressions consistying of Sanskrit and English words have been listed according to the first word in either the Sanskrit or in the English Index. Numbers refer to pages of the main text. The Introduction with the summary of the rules has not been included. The Sanskrit Index follows the *devanāgarī* alphabet.

SANSKRIT INDEX

ENGLISH INDEX

THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

(*With translation and explanatory notes*)

S.D. Joshi and **J.A.F. Roodbergen**

Volume-1 (1.1.1–1.1.75)
Pages : vi + 144 + Index — First Edn : 1992
ISBN : 81-7201-166-0 — **Rs. 160**

Volume-2 (1.2.1–1.2.73)
Pages : xviii + 131 + Index — First Edn. : 1993
ISBN : 81-7201-500-3 — **Rs. 160**

Volume-3 (1.3.1–1.3.93)
Pages : x + 168 + Index — First Edn. : 1994
ISBN : 81-7201-781-2 — **Rs. 150**

Volume-4 (1.4.1–1.4.110)
Pages : xxiv + 268 + Index — First Edn. : 1995
ISBN : 81-7201-510-0 — **Rs. 220**

Volume-5 (2.1.1–2.1.72)
Pages : xiv + 152 + Index — First Edn. : 1996
ISBN : 81-260-0145-3 — **Rs. 180**

Volume-6 (2.2.1–2.2.38)
Pages : xxiv + 100 + Index — First Edn. : 1997
ISBN : 81-260-0316-2 — **Rs. 150**

Volume-7 (2.3.1–2.3.73)
Pages : xxvi + 134 + Index — First Edn. : 1998
ISBN : 81-260-0589-0 — **Rs. 160**

Volume-8 (2.4.1–2.4.85)
Pages : xxxiv + 166 + Index — First Edn. : 2000
ISBN : 81-260-0751-6 — **Rs. 200**

Volume-9 (6.4.1–6.4.175)
Pages : lxvii + 435 + Index — First Edn. : 2002
ISBN : 81-260-1348-6 — **Rs. 200**

SAHITYA AKADEMI

त

न्यायबोधिन्याः संस

आचार्यकेदारन